ANTI-PURITAN SATIRE IN SELECTED SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PLAYS

by

EDWIN T. SANDBERG

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy,
in the Department of English of
Indiana University
July, 1951

ProQuest Number: 10295751

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest 10295751

Published by ProQuest LLC (2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.
This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

A Prefatory Note

There has been a pronounced tendency in literary circles to accept the suggestion that the Puritan was a frequent target for dramatic attack during the seventeenth century, but the actual attitude of the dramatists toward the Puritans has never been thoroughly investigated.

It is the purpose of this writer to attempt to determine the actual treatment of the Puritans on the stage and thus to ascertain just how far-reaching the anti-Puritan satire was. The writer has read extensively in the drama of the century and has found that much of the satire used by the dramatists is repeated in play after play with no noticeable change in emphasis. For this reason it has been considered advisable to discuss only selected plays. The process of selection may be simply stated: only those plays which include the various types of satire and represent adequately the attitudes of the dramatists toward the Puritans are discussed; with one or two exceptions, the plays are not discussed in their entirety; rather, the kinds of Puritan caricatures are discussed as groups. This means that the unit of discussion is not the play, but the individual caricature. In the final analysis, the importance of the study really rests upon presenting a clear picture of the development of the satire in all its aspects. For the convenience of the reader, other plays containing anti-Puritan satire are listed in the appendix.

The century is divided into three periods: the Jacobean (1603-25); the Caroline (1625-42); and the Restoration (1660-1700). The Commonwealth period (1642-1660) is not discussed for two reasons: first, most of the drama was read rather than presented on the stage and thus practically escapes the definition of drama; secondly, the few plays staged were usually presented surreptitiously and their authors were anonymous.

The arrangement of the century into three periods permits the writer to show the continuity of the developing anti-Puritan satire. In the Jacobean period, for example, the directness and frankness of the satire are obvious;

in the Caroline period there is a marked difference in the attitudes of the major and the minor playwrights and a distinct shift from an attack on Puritanism to an assault on "puritanism." This shift in emphasis results in a milder attack, and some of the dramatists show special tolerance. In the Restoration period conventional attacks appear, but the attack on "puritanism" continues, especially in the country versus city theme. It is also significant that this period produces violent attacks on the Puritans' political activities during the Commonwealth.

At first mention the production date of each play is given to enable the reader to place chronologically the play and its author. In all cases only the essential part of a passage is presented: there is no justifiable reason for including long, only distantly related remarks. When quoted out of context, a passage is considered in its relationship to the whole play if this affects the interpretation. All line and page annotations to the plays refer to the editions listed in the bibliography.

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Josephine K. Piercy of the Department of English at Indiana University for her helpful assistance during the writing of this dissertation. Grateful acknowledgment is also extended to Professors R. W. Battenhouse, Frank Davidson, and John Robert Moore, all of whom have given generously of their time and knowledge. Special thanks are given to the Indiana University Library and the Newberry Library in Chicago. The assistance of the personnel at both institutions has been of inestimable value.

E. T. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One.....1
The Basis for the Anti-Puritan Satire

Chapter Two.....26
Jacobean Anti-Puritan Satire

Chapter Three.....70
Caroline Anti-Puritan Satire

Chapter Four.....121
Restoration Anti-Puritan Satire

Appendix.....171
Other Plays Containing Anti-Puritan Satire

Bibliography.....175

Chapter One

The Basis for the Anti-Puritan Satire

The success of any attempt to discuss the anti-Puritan dramatic satire of the seventeenth century is necessarily dependent upon a clear recognition of Puritan attributes offering the greatest opportunities for exaggeration to the dramatists. Briefly enumerated, these were: religious enthusiasm and seriousness, piety, thrift, aggressiveness, industriousness, opposition to authority not sanctioned by the Bible, and honesty and fairness in business transactions.

Since these attitudes are so closely intermixed, it is unwise to discuss them separately. In Puritan domestic life, for example, one finds that thrift, morality, piety, Godliness, honesty, sobriety, and valor were all of equal importance.[1] Such qualities were considered fundamental aspects of the spiritual other-worldliness of the reformist movement; yet they found their places in the practical activities of the Puritans as well.

Enthusiasm and seriousness are reflected in all these

[1] John S. Flynn, The Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English (New York, 1920), pp. 66-75.

attitudes, for Puritanism itself took shape as a strong and sincere reaction against the formalized worship and lack of spiritual vitality in the Established Church.[2] Basically religious in nature, the movement sought to perpetuate the emphases of the Reformation in English church life, to abolish Roman methods of worship entirely,[3] and to reorganize the Church of England with the purpose of preserving the liberty of its clerical and lay members according to principles considered by the Puritans as established by tradition and common law.[4] It should be clear from these expressed intentions that initially the movement was almost exclusively interested in religious matters, and the Puritans' great concern for moral and spiritual salvation always dominated their participation in commercial or political affairs. In fact, the reformers' endeavors in politics were essentially undertaken to

---

[2]The lack of spiritual vitality characterized the Anglican Church not only during the seventeenth century but well into the nineteenth. See Elie Halevy, England in 1815 (New York, 1949), pp. 389-485.

[3]For a good account of the vigorous agitation against remaining Roman practices in the church, see "The Elizabethan Vestiarian Controversy," in M. M. Knappen's Tudor Puritanism (Chicago, 1939), pp. 187-216.

[4]Harry G. Plum, Restoration Puritanism (Chapel Hill, 1943), p. 6.

assure the existence of their religious faith.[5]

Acceptance of the Bible (and of God's will as expressed solely therein) as the ultimate authority in all matters greatly encouraged the Puritan belief in justification by faith alone, a dogma which contrasted somewhat with the emphasis of the medieval church on good works. Naturally, the acceptance of the absolute supremacy of God's will in all affairs resulted in an emphasis upon its faultlessness in every instance. Wholehearted reception of the doctrine of justification by faith also encouraged the Puritans to shout and fight for their religion. The resulting belligerency was much derided by the Anglicans and others opposed to the reforming groups.

Religious enthusiasm on the part of the Puritans was further stimulated by the emotionalism of the sermons of the dissenting preachers.[6] Extremely fiery and hortatory sermons, three to four hours in length, were not at all uncommon, and elaborate and picturesque speech was habitually employed in stirring exhortations to virtuous living. The Puritans felt God about them; they enjoyed

---

[5]A. F. S. Pearson, Church and State (Cambridge, 1928), p. 132.

[6]William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York, 1938), pp. 128-72.

a personal relationship with Him. Many of the believers even sought for indications of Divine will by selecting Bible verses at random and following the advice found in the opened pages.[7]

Avid acceptance of Bible texts without questioning their validity is best indicated by the large number of religious books printed in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Bible itself was printed and distributed in larger numbers than ever before, and books explaining the Holy Writ were to be seen everywhere. In 1612, for example, Thomas Wilson's A Christian Dictionary appeared; three years later saw the publication of A Divine Dictionary; Or, The Bible Abbreviated by H. S. Of a similar nature, Clement Cotton's The Christians Concordance: Containing the Most materiall words in the New Testament was printed in 1622. These books and similar ones contributed greatly to the enthusiasm with which the Puritans embraced their religious beliefs, for all books of this kind directed their readers' attention either to the need for steadfast faith in God as the key to everlasting salvation or to the true desirability of strict morality

---

[7]It is interesting to note that this practice was followed by the Wesleyans of the eighteenth century. See W. E. H. Lecky, A History of England in the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1888-90), II, 594-95.

on earth.[8] Thus, while the Puritan has often inaccurately been called a man of one book (the Bible), perhaps no man ever had a wider range of books dealing with the same subject: earthly enthusiasm as an outward indication of an inner hope of being saved.

This would at first seem to be at odds with the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, which held not only that God's will was absolute but that He had determined before a man's birth whether or not he should ultimately gain eternal reward. The fatalism inherent in such a doctrine cannot be denied, but the inability to determine which people were of the "elect" group encouraged all followers of Calvinistic principles to live noble lives dedicated to the service of God and their fellowmen. The desire to live in a manner acceptable to their Creator was translated by the Puritans not only into enthusiastic demonstrations of faith but also into a quiet seriousness of conduct often ridiculed by their opponents as "preciseness." Puritan preciseness was really nothing more than an emphasis on humility, seriousness, simplicity: in essence it was displayed in

[8] Louis B. Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill, 1935), p. 228.

the simple clothing, the plain speech, the unadorned simplicity of their homes. The sharp contrast between the Puritans and the courtiers in regard to ostentation hardly needs mentioning but is significant since the simple Puritan qualities were grist for the satirists' mill.

Just as the good life was directed by God (according to the Puritans, evil was directed by the devil; there could be no evasion of this simple corollary. Thus, while God acted through His "elect," especially the preaching brethren, Satan acted through witches and other possessors of evil spirits. From this point of view, the enthusiasm displayed in the Puritan opposition to witches was easily understandable by their contemporaries; indeed, Elizabeth recognized it as justifiable and accordingly acquiesced in the Puritan demands for the persecution of people suspected of sorcery and witchcraft. James I went a step further, for in his Daemonologie (1603) he stated that witches and sorcerers did exist and that they should be tried and condemned to death for the good of the kingdom.[9] There appears to have been more than

[9] See Section 3, "Witchcraft," in Daemonologie (New York, 1924). This is a fine facsimile edition limited to fifty copies.

acquiescence in his attitude toward the Puritan demands for the execution of witches, for James' attitude was evidently more radical than that of the Puritans themselves.

But practical demonstrations of Puritan religious enthusiasm were not confined to attacks upon evil spirits; all social evils drew their share of attention from the reformers. As social corruption in the court and society grew, more and more citizens were converted to the Puritan movement, which so vigorously expressed its opposition to the general indecency of the period.[10] The whole history of the Puritan attack on the theaters can be convincingly described as the outgrowth of the increasing popular resentment on the part of all classes of society to the indecencies of the stage and court.[11] When one remembers the general decadence of the drama during the seventeenth century--a decadence which grew more pronounced throughout the century--the justice of Puritan attacks on the theater is obvious. Moreover, the Puritans objected not only to the indecency of the stage but also

---

[10]Herbert N. Henson, Puritanism in England (London, 1912), p. 75.

[11]Elbert N. S. Thompson, The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage (New York, 1903), pp. 119-27.

to the large sums of money spent in producing plays and court masques. Charity was a very real part of the Puritan character,[12] and a man's religious sincerity was very often gauged by his generosity to the less fortunate: accordingly, the true Puritan would tend to be strongly intolerant of the extravagance in the theaters. What amazes the modern reader of Jacobean, Caroline, and Restoration literature is that the anti-Puritan writers largely failed to take the general seriousness of the Puritan attitude into account. Yet this is not difficult to explain: the exaggerated enthusiasm of individuals among the Puritans was better adapted to the satirical treatment of the dramatists than was the general seriousness of the large movement, and there is no disputing the fact that many Puritans were radicals in the plainest sense of the word.

That such radical manifestations of Puritan enthusiasm were not characteristic of the entire group is evidenced by the general seriousness which tended to hold the various sectaries together, giving at least a unity of tone among the diversity of opinions. It is important that this

---

[12] This is not meant to imply that charity was an exclusively Puritan trait or that the Puritans were the only people who objected to the extravagance and indecency of the theater; many Anglicans shared these attitudes.

diversity of opinions be remembered, however, for the degree of enthusiasm exhibited by the Puritans varied with the different groups. In fact, not all the sectaries completely accepted Calvinistic doctrine although examination of the plays reveals a general tendency by the dramatists to treat "Puritan" as synonymous with "Calvinist." As a matter of fact, although most sectaries are identified in the plays by name or by reference to their continental places of origin, confusion still prevails and the enthusiasm exhibited by one sectary was generally attributed to the whole Puritan movement.

The difficulty of reconciling the varying degrees of enthusiasm of the groups is indisputable. The Anabaptists, for example, represented the more extreme elements of the protesting groups and could not even reconcile the conflicting opinions among themselves. On only a few points was there any real unity among them: all the Anabaptists insisted on re-baptism as a symbol of membership in the brotherhood; all held the firm conviction that they were guided by an "inner light"; they united in maintaining that all true believers ought to live a communal life in settlements modelled on the descriptions

of primitive Christian communities as given in the Bible.[13] But perhaps the most extreme of these Anabaptist groups was the sect called the Family of Love: this movement combined the principles of the Anabaptists and the later Quakers. So eccentric were its practicing members considered (They were even said to practice "free love.") that the term "Familist" came to be applied to any eccentric religious mystic.[14]

It must be seen, then, that only the common principle of opposition to the Church of England forced the sects to work together in their religious and political activities. It was for this reason that there was little serious division (insofar as the maintenance of a united protest was concerned) among the Puritans until after the Civil War.[15] This is not to say that there was no opportunity for individualism, however, for the very dependence upon the Bible as the sole authority in both ecclesiastical and lay matters encouraged the individual to form his own judgment based upon a personal interpretation

---

[13]For a full definition of Anabaptism, see Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation (Edinburgh, 1907-08), II, 421-69.

[14]Haller, op. cit., p. 206.

[15]Henson, op. cit., pp. 138-40.

579176

of the Scriptures. It was this same individualism which characterized much of the vigor exhibited by the Puritans in their opposition to Anglican religious domination and royal political domination; actually a spirit of competition between individuals arose: the man who could exhibit the most enthusiasm was thus often regarded as being particularly blessed by God.

It might be said that the Puritan struggle for religious and political liberty was rooted in the intense individualism of the movement;[16] but even here caution must be observed, for complete hatred of authority was by no means entirely characteristic of the Puritan classes. While Puritan interest in religious and political liberty permitted much individualism, it also exalted the authority of God (and a religious and political organization pleasing to Him) to restrict that individualism in keeping with the dictates of His will as expressed in the Bible and in Calvinistic interpretations of the Bible. It was in these respects that Puritanism assumed its political coloring; one needs only to remember that Thomas Cartwright seriously tried to separate opposition to the Established Church from opposition to the state and that he accepted the

---

[16] Henry O. Wakeman, The Church and the Puritans (London, 1897), pp. 60-61.

doctrine of absolutism on the part of the crown, like most of the other Elizabethan Puritans, as long as this royal sovereignty was compatible with the dictates of God's will as recorded in the Bible and Calvinistic dogma. That he failed to separate these oppositions was made clear in Whitgrift's assertion that the great reformer's anti-episcopal opinions were in reality anti-monarchical.[17]

Cartwright's difficulty is easily realized when one recognizes the seriousness with which the Puritans regarded the liberty of thought and action of the individual in religious matters: to the Puritans any authority (except the Bible) which restricted the individual's freedom was evil. Consequently, the reduction of the powers of a tyrannical royal government and an equally tyrannical Established Church (so closely connected as to be virtually indivisible), and the interpretation of the common law in such a manner as would make it possible for the nation to assure freedom for all men, were the real ideals and

---

[17]Pearson, op. cit., pp. 9-40; see also by the same author: Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism (Cambridge, 1925). The Puritan regard for authority was also shown in the American settlements. See Perry Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts (Cambridge, 1933) and The New England Mind (New York, 1939); also Samuel Eliot Morison, The Puritan Pronaos (London, 1936). Especially recommended in the last two books are the sections entitled "Puritans."

goals of Puritanism in its political manifestations.[18] But the need for authority was carefully considered, and it should be noted that a fine balance between individual liberty and the need for social stability was long maintained by the dissenters.[19] The practical effects of the Puritans' attempt to establish a compromise between individualism and central authority were demonstrated in their vigorous advocacy of a Godly commonwealth. This form of government was largely based upon the idea that God, in the face of man's sinfulness, established a covenantal form of government for His own glory. All human activities and beliefs were subject to this government: Puritan attitudes toward church attendance, Bible reading, public amusements, dress, conduct, the operation of business concerns and the regulation of profits, political supremacy, and organized charity were of necessity subjected to the irreproachable authority of God. The basic antagonism between the Puritans and the Royalists was increased by the fact that rulers as well as subjects had to recognize the absolute power of this covenantal government.

---

[18] Plum, op. cit., p. 10.

[19] Knappen, op. cit., p. 346.

But the interest in individualism was not ignored even under this authoritarian form of control, for the formal organization of the Calvinistic churches was itself essentially democratic, the higher ministrations coming chiefly from the congregation. The deriving of authority from below appealed to men weary of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Anglican Church; it was easy for the Puritans (and for many who were not Puritans) to embrace firmly a form of church government in which the individual had some control over the officials who in turn controlled him. Moreover, Puritan enthusiasm offered other attractive features besides this democratic organization--the passion for righteousness, the dislike of Popish innovations, and the desire for political liberty. All these characteristics helped to gain sincere converts to the Puritan banner.[20] The sincerity which was so marked in the Puritan movement made it an easy matter for the dissenters to show emotionalism in their religious ceremonies, in their lives, and in their opposition to authority which refused to follow the dictates of God as recorded in the Bible.

As stated earlier, all Puritan characteristics can

---

[20] Thompson, op. cit., p. 189.

be included under the general term of enthusiasm; for piety, thrift, aggressiveness, industriousness, and the passion for liberty equally reflect the ardent efforts of the Puritans to secure public acceptance of their faith. However, some features of the movement need further clarification. Puritan piety, for example, was not an ascetic thing; rather, it provided a moral code which furnished instructions for pious and practical living.[21] In this respect it differed from the piety of the Anglicans and Catholics; Puritan practicality is the most essential part of this code. Contemporary descriptions of the influence of this code on the lives of its followers are plentiful; one might quote one of these:

> It was a distinguishing mark of a Puritan in these times, to see him going to church twice a day with his Bible under his arm....They [the Puritans] were circumspect as to all the excesses of eating, drinking, apperel, and lawful diversions, being frugal in housekeeping, industrious in their particular callings, honest and exact in their dealings, and solicitous to give everyone his own.[22]

But the conduct dictated by this pious code was extended into areas other than religion and domestic life. Honesty and thrift became the cornerstones of Puritan mercantile practices; encouraged by the basic

---

[21] Knappen, op. cit., pp. 424-41.

[22] Neal quotes this description in his The History of the Puritans (Portsmouth, N. H., 1816-17), I, 560-61.

tenets of the Puritan faith, these virtues were constantly being extolled in the pious literature of the times.[23] Perhaps the strongest part of the code in this respect was found in one of the basic Puritan beliefs: the ever-present possibility of divine intervention for the purpose of rewarding or punishing men for their behavior. This Puritan tenet became a standard ingredient in the plots of the domestic tragedies which began to appear in England during the latter part of the sixteenth century.[24] In fact, the Puritan belief in divine intervention in the affairs of the world was so commonly accepted that some of the dramatists actually used Puritan religious tracts as sources for their plays. This may be seen, for example, by comparing Middleton's The Changeling (1623) and Women, Beware Women (1628) with The Triumphs of God's Revenge Against Murther (1621) by the Puritan homilist John Reynolds.[25]

The belief in the possibility that God might smite a sinner at any time served as a very real deterrent to unscrupulous practices on the part of the merchants; for

---

[23] Wright, op. cit., pp. 236-96. There is a detailed discussion of Puritan pious literature in these pages.

[24] See Henry H. Adams, English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642 (New York, 1943), pp. 48-53 and 185.

[25] Albert C. Baugh, et al, A Literary History of England (New York, 1948), p. 567.

it must be remembered that while the pious code helped to establish the foundations of modern capitalistic business practices by encouraging individualism, it also placed restraints upon the exploitation of the poor. It has been pointed out by Max Weber and others that modern capitalism has its origin in Calvinistic theology because of the essential individualism of the latter. If each man is dependent upon the Bible as his means of learning the will of God, then salvation in reality becomes an individual matter between man and his Creator. Moreover, Calvin laid down in the economic sphere two important rules: one of these was to work zealously in one's calling, and the other was to avoid luxuries and pleasures resulting from the accumulation of money. When one combines industriousness and parsimoniousness, the result is almost certain to be wealth. Thus, wealth came to be regarded by the Puritans as an indication of divine blessing, and the Puritan code ceased to be ascetic;[26] the reformers' only concern was that this wealth not be used for luxuries, vanities, and indecencies.

---

[26]Alexander Gray, The Development of Economic Doctrine (London, 1931), pp. 72-73. For fuller discussions of the importance of Calvinism in the growth of modern capitalism, see R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York, 1926) and Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York, 1930).

Specific attitudes growing out of the pious code of Puritanism included a strong dislike for usury, an emphasis upon the desirability of generous charity, and a condemnation of unthrifty idleness. The last-mentioned attitude was a natural outgrowth of the Puritan struggle for religious, commercial, and political recognition. As Wright remarks, any group intent upon success naturally abhors idleness, a deterrent to that success.[27] Consequently, Puritan insistence on initiative was evidenced by industriousness, a willingness to sacrifice comforts and conveniences, and an attack on luxuries. The reformers were eager for power; they obtained it very largely through their control of trade and commerce. Since the successful control of trade depended upon industriousness, a bankrupt was considered indolent and no sympathy was wasted on him.

The other fields of endeavor in which the Puritans were particularly successful were law, medicine, and agriculture,[28] and the prominent men of the party belonged, for the most part, to the country gentleman class.[29] This is not to imply, as has so often been done, that the

---

[27] Wright, op. cit., pp. 230-31.

[28] Knappen, op. cit., p. 353.

[29] Flynn, op. cit., p. 24.

majority of the middle class was Puritan by profession but merely to assert that the most vociferous and aggressive part of that class was the Puritan element.

The basic opposition which developed between the Puritans and the courtiers was thus the natural outcome of the differences in the beliefs of the two classes. The Puritans, as already suggested, objected to the stage and court because of the idleness and extravagance which flourished in those places; the courtiers, on the other hand, objected to the plain, severe lives the Puritans led. As will be seen in the ensuing discussion of selected seventeenth-century plays, the Puritans[30] fared badly in the satirical use made of them by the dramatists, but their real power in political and commercial affairs continued to grow. The latter fact was an increasing source of worry to the upper classes; fear and envy of this success undoubtedly played a major part in the development of the strong anti-Puritan satirical movement on the stage.

This movement really began in the Elizabethan period.

---

[30]In origin, the term itself was a symbol of contempt, and even the Puritans objected to being called such. See Benson, op. cit., p. 5.

A Knack to Know a Knave (1592)[31] is generally considered the earliest existing play which contains detailed, effective satire against the Puritans.[32] In this early play is found the conventionalized portrayal of the Puritan as it was to develop in seventeenth-century drama. Greed and hypocrisy, the most common attributes of the later Puritan caricature, are already here presented.[33]

In a detailed study of the works of Dekker,[34] Mary G. M. Adkins finds that the chief attack against the Puritans in his plays is based on their use of religious enthusiasm and hypocrisy as a cloak for immorality and other evil practices.[35] Such treatment of the Puritans

---

[31] Dates given are performance dates as listed in Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* (Philadelphia, 1940).

[32] Mary G. M. Adkins, "The Genesis of Dramatic Satire against the Puritans, as Illustrated in 'A Knack to Know a Knave,' " *Review of English Studies*, XXII (April, 1946), 81-95.

[33] It became a fixed Elizabethan dramatic practice to condemn private greed. See the chapter, "The Sea," in Richard V. Lindabury's *A Study of Patriotism in the Elizabethan Drama* (Oxford, 1931).

[34] Dekker's plays are not discussed in this study, for most of his anti-Puritan satire occurs in works prior to the accession of James I in 1603.

[35] Mary G. M. Adkins, *Puritanism in the Plays and Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker* (Austin, 1940).

by the dramatists was not unique in English literature of the period; attacks upon the group were made in essays, poems, and tracts as well.[36] That the objections to Puritan religiosity continued to grow is best shown by Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy (1621), which clearly summarizes the thoughts of the Elizabethan and Jacobean attacks upon the Puritans; Burton makes the Puritan a person so fanatical about his religion that he is lacking in common sense:

> Plato in his Phoedrus hath those words, Apollo's priests at Delphi, and at Dodona, in their fury do many pretty feats, and benefit the Greeks, but never in their right wits. He makes them all mad, as well he might; and he that shall but consider that superstition of old, those prodigious effects of it (as in its place I will show the several furies of our Fatidici Dii, Pythonissas, Sibyls, Enthusiasts, Pseudo-prophets, Hereticks, Schismaticks in these our latter ages) shall instantly confess, that all the world again cannot afford so much matter of madness, so many stupend symptoms, as superstition, heresy, schism hath brought out; that this species alone may be paralleled to all the former, hath a greater latitude, and more miraculous effects; that it more besots and infatuates men, than any other above named whatsoever, doth more harm, works more disquietness to mankind, and hath more crucified the souls of mortal men (such hath been the Devil's craft) than wars, plagues, sicknesses, dearth, famine, and all the rest.[37]

Burton's severe censure, here quoted, on those "pestilent

---

[36] Some of the most violent anti-Puritan prose attacks are found in the answers to the Mar-Prelate Tracts (1588-89).

[37] Robert Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy (London, 1904), Part III, Sect. IV, Mem. I, Subs. I.

parsons who make election, predestination, and reprobation the theme of their ordinary sermons, frightening poor harmless people with threats of damnation," effectively supported the dramatists' portrayal of the Puritan on the stage as a religious fanatic, lacking the ability to lead a wholesome, well-balanced life.

As will become evident in the following chapter, it is in the plays of Ben Jonson that the Puritan definitely becomes a fixed stage-type; his characteristics are enthusiasm, hypocrisy, and greed in the order of their importance. In fact, Jonson's early attacks upon the Puritans, in the guise of humor characters, inspired a great wave of subsequent portraits of the extremist sects of the Puritan party.[38]

As is usually true, this satire is not marked by truthfulness of detail, but it is extremely effective when it takes an existing characteristic of the Puritans and exaggerates this into a caricature. In ridiculing the middle and lower class origins of the reformers, dramatists portrayed them on the stage as ignorant and boorish; because of the Puritan emphasis on plain and simple speech, the caricatures are given a rasping

---

[38]Mina Kerr, Influence of Ben Jonson on English Comedy, 1598-1642 (Philadelphia, 1912).

clerical speech and sneering attitudes; Puritan initiative and aggressiveness are portrayed as forwardness and belligerency; and the Puritan disapproval of fasting as a religious ceremony earned them the reputation of being gluttons.

In examining the larger changes in the Puritan character involved in its transfer to the satirical drama, one finds that enthusiasm becomes fanaticism; thrift becomes greed, usury, and covetousness; industriousness becomes boldness and impudence; piety becomes hypocrisy; sincerity of belief becomes intolerance. Of these changes only the last has any real foundation in fact, for it is true that the strict Puritan felt that his religion was the only correct one and the only one to be tolerated on earth.

But perhaps the most vicious attack which is revealed in a careful examination of Jacobean, Caroline, and Restoration drama is the inference, and even occasional direct assertion, that Puritan successes in the fields they entered were very largely owing to their accumulation of wealth. The dramatists were quick to aver that this wealth was used not for charitable purposes (as much of it really was) or for honest expansion of Puritan interests

in secular endeavors. They made it extremely clear that, in their minds at least, such Puritan successes had been achieved through the media of bribery and corruption.[39]

Such transfers of emphasis, and distortions of the true Puritan character, do not account for all the satire. In the plays discussed in the following chapters there are examples of direct satire of individuals prominent in contemporary affairs, many instances of attacks on Puritan intolerance, and clear strokes of bitter disapproval of Puritan political activities during the period of the Commonwealth. From the point of view of both directness and indirectness, the anti-Puritan dramatic satire of the seventeenth century is equally significant in amount and virulence.

---

[39]Again the reader is advised that this does not mean that the Puritans were the only honest, industrious, thrifty people.

Chapter Two

Jacobean Anti-Puritan Satire

1603-1625

In view of the many elaborate Puritan caricatures in some Jacobean plays, as well as the earlier satire in Elizabethan drama, one wonders why scholars have paid so little attention to anti-Puritan dramatic satire during the seventeenth century. While there are many general statements about the extent of this satire,[1] the fact that the Puritan practically becomes a fixture on the Jacobean stage has been largely overlooked. Actually, the Puritan appears in many of the plays in one form or another. It is not necessary to search for the label "Puritan" in the dramatis personae; true, there are some plays, particularly those of Ben Jonson, which name characters as Puritans, but the majority of the playwrights preferred to label them as merchants, country knights, lawyers, doctors, aldermen, misers. This writer regards such labeling as important, for it shows clearly the fields

---

[1] Almost any good history of drama mentions anti-Puritan satire in the seventeenth century, but most of these histories pay an undue amount of attention to Restoration drama and neglect the great amount of satire in Jacobean and Caroline plays.

in which the Puritans were achieving their greatest successes.[2]

The use of varied identifications does not indicate a lessening attack; as a matter of fact, the dramatists do not greatly moderate their attack on Jacobean Puritans as the latter became more powerful politically. The most that can be said is that these attacks do become more subtle as the period progresses. This is clear in the later plays of the period, for only Fletcher's and Massinger's Women Pleased (1620) actively portrays the Puritan as a person marching to the pipe of persecution and trying to stop the morris-dances. The indirectness of the later satire is the result not only of the fears arising from increased Puritan influence and power in public life (especially in opposition to the theater)[3] but also of the desire of the dramatists to avoid the crudity of the earlier satires.

Certainly the dramatists were not unaware of the

---

[2]See Chapter 1, pp. 16-19. Such labeling obviously does not mean that the dramatists regarded all such figures as Puritans.

[3]That the Puritan attack on the theaters was the basic reason for the satire directed against them is seen in such theatrical defenses as Heywood's Apology for Actors (1612) and Field's Remonstrance (1616). See Thompson, op. cit.

Puritan desire for the closing of the theaters, at first prompted by pious and sincere hostility to the indecency of the stage and its great extravagance. To this was added the sincere Puritan acceptance of the idea of divine intervention in earthly affairs, especially the interpretation of the plague as an indication of God's displeasure with mankind.[4] Since a good dramatist will always hesitate to incur further anger against his profession, the strong Puritan agitation caused playwrights to tone down their attacks upon the Puritans.

This is not to say that the dramatists appreciated the sincerity of the Puritans regarding their conduct of their lives; there is little evidence of that. Instead Puritan religious sincerity and enthusiasm are subjected to strong ridicule, and religious seriousness is depicted as hypocrisy. Thus, in Westward Hoe (1604), written by Dekker and Webster, Puritanism is found convincingly ridiculed when Mistress Honeysuckle says:

> Talke and make a noise, no matter to what purpose,
> I have learn'd that with going to puritan Lectures.[5]

In Jonson's Volpone (1606) Puritan enthusiasm is again attacked (The play is not confined to the development of

---

[4]The effectiveness of Puritan opposition to the theaters is discussed in Margaret B. Pickel's Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama (London, 1936). See page 97 for a listing of theater closings because of the plague.

[5]I,1--p. 292.

the theme of human greed.);[6] yet the striking satire against Puritan religiosity is often overlooked.

In the scene in which the dwarf Nano, the hermaphrodite Androgyno, and the eunuch Castrone appear, Jonson utilizes Nano's speech about the Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of the soul to satirize the preciseness of the Puritans. In response to Androgyno's questions about the last resting place of the soul, Nano answers that it will go

> Into a very strange beast, by some writers cal'd an asse;
> By others, a precise, pure, illuminate brother,
> Of those devoure flesh, and sometimes one another:
> And will drop you forth a libell or a sanctified lie,
> Betwixt every spoonefull of a nativitie-pie.[7]

The passage is particularly interesting since it directly attacks the Puritan attitude toward fasting, picturing it as a mere excuse for continuous gluttony. Moreover, the attitude itself is attributed by Nano to Puritan fanaticism in observance of Calvinistic religious doctrines.

The identification of fanaticism with Puritan enthusiasm and sincerity is a marked characteristic of the early anti-Puritan dramatic satire. In Eastward Hoe (1605), for example, Jonson has Touchstone and Woolfe question the

---

[6] There is nothing to indicate that the greed satirized in the play is interpreted as Puritan greed.

[7] I, ii--42-46.

insistence of Master Quicksilver that he be permitted to continue to practice his religion. While the satire here is direct enough, it is significant that Woolfe seems to find something admirable about the young man's persistence in his religious duty; that Woolfe makes no secret of the fact that he is well acquainted with "almost all religions in the land" adds strength to his remark that he has never seen such a devout and penitent prisoner:

> Touchstone--I doe wonder, M. Woolfe, why you should travaile thus, in a businesse so contrary to kinde, or the nature o' your Place! that you beeing the Keeper of a Prison, should labour the release of your Prisoners! Whereas mee thinkes, it were farre more Naturall, and Kindely in you, to be ranging about for more, and not let these scape you have alreadie under the Tooth. But they say, you Wolves, when you ha' suck'd the blood once, that they are drie, you ha' done.
> Woolfe------Sir, your Worship may descant as you please o' my name, but I protest, I was never so mortified with any mens discourse, or behaviour in Prison; yet I have had of all sorts of men i' the Kingdome under my Keyes: and almost of all Religions i' the land, as Papist, Protestant, Puritane, Brownist, Anabaptist, Millenary, Famely o' Love, Jewe, Turke, Infidell, Atheist, Good Fellow, etc.[8]

The devoutness and sincerity of the prisoners are displayed in their speech and in their conduct; Woolfe is amazed by their plain manner of speaking and the poise which complete acceptance of their religion gives them. It is

---

[8] BV, I--19-34.

significant also that the list he gives of various religions carefully separates the sects adhering to the Puritan party from the larger movement. The real importance of the Puritan party in Woolfe's mind is especially noticeable by his including it with the other truly influential religions in the kingdom: the Papist and the Protestant (Anglican).

Woolfe is further questioned about his prisoners; he remarks that their behavior is characterized by extreme humility and devotion:

> Woolfe------Humilitie, Sir? I, were your Worshippe an Eyewitnesse of it, you would say so. The Knight will i' the Knights-Ward, doe what wee can Sir, and Maister Quicksilver, would be i' the Hole, if we would let him. I never knew, or saw Prisoners more penitent, or more devout. They will sit you up all night singing of Psalmes, and edifying the whole Prison; onely, Securitie sings a note to high, sometimes, because he lyes i' the Two-penny Ward, farre of, and can not take his time....
> Touchstone--Which on 'hem is't is so devout, the Knight, or the t'other?
> Woolfe------Both Sir. But the young Man especially! I never heard his like! He has cut his hayre too. He is so well given, and has such good gifts! Hee can tell you, almost all the Stories of the Booke of Martyrs, and speake you all the Sicke-Mans Salve[9] without Booke.[10]

Both the mention of psalm-singing and the names of

---

[9]The book was written by Thomas Becan and published in 1561.

[10]V,1--41-58.

popular pious books of the period convey anti-Puritan satire; Woolfe emphasizes the zeal with which Quicksilver approaches all religious matters.

But satire of Puritan enthusiasm is not, as here, confined to the observance of religious commands; it is extended to include Puritan attitudes toward real or imagined evils. Perhaps the best example of the latter type of satire is found in Ford's The Witch of Edmonton (1621).[11] In essence, the entire play is a most effective attack on the radical Puritan attitude toward witchcraft. The satire is expressed through the character of Old Banks, an extremely radical representative of the dissenters. Disliking the harmless Elizabeth Sawyer, he loses no opportunity to accuse her of being a witch before there is any real reason to believe her one.[12] He is hardly satisfied with this accusation, for he shouts that he would call her worse names if he knew any.[13] This is, in a sense, a very effective means of satirising the seriousness with which the Puritans regarded suspected

---

[11] The play was written in collaboration with Dekker and W. Rowley.

[12] It is interesting that Reginald Scot, in his Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584), had stated that, in the majority of cases brought before magistrates, the witch-mongers extorted confessions from innocent people by mental and physical tortures.

[13] II,i.

sorcerers and witches.

But the most telling stroke of satire is that which reveals the harassing of the old woman by Banks and his friends; innocent at first of any wrongdoing, she is actually forced to employ magic means to beat off her attackers. A spirit in the shape of a black dog is sent to do her bidding after she has prayed to the devil for aid. Since she has been accused of being responsible for many untoward accidents in the vicinity even before her actual bargain with Satan, the agitation only increases when her attackers believe they have real evidence against her.[14]

It is interesting to note here the close relationship between the life of the period and the drama. The Witch of Edmonton is based on an actual incident which culminated in a witchcraft trial in 1622.[15] Recognizing the strong Puritan agitation for the prosecution of the woman involved, as well as the growing public belief in the dangers of widespread witchcraft, Ford, Rowley, and Dekker obviously capitalized upon the great contemporary interest in the proceedings. This factor in the drama

---

[14] IV.

[15] See the introductory notes to the play in H. Weber's The Dramatic Works of John Ford (Edinburgh, 1811).

of the Jacobean era is worth noticing, for it foreshadows the increased attachment of the drama to contemporary life in the Caroline period. Jonson, for example, never sets his comedies in exotic foreign locales but utilizes London as the background.[16] This enables the dramatist to portray the raucous activity of the streets of the city in a convincing manner and accordingly to add realism to his satire.[17]

In Bartholomew Fair (1614), for example, the scene is laid at a busy fair; this setting, with its color, noise and teeming activity, helps to enhance the effectiveness of the satire against the Puritans, which one critic has classed justifiably as mordant.[18] The religious enthusiasm of Rabbi Zeal-of-the-Land Busy is thus thrust against the sacrilegious atmosphere of vendors' booths and strolling entertainers' efforts to amuse the crowd. This enthusiasm on Busy's part is described by Littlewit in the most satirical vein:

---

[16] Charles G. Osgood, The Voice of England (New York, 1935), pp. 199-200.

[17] Helena W. Baum, The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedies (Chapel Hill, 1947).

[18] Charles M. Gayley, ed., Representative English Comedies (New York, 1913), II, 13.

> Stirring! Yes, and studying an old Elder, come from Banbury, a Suitor that puts in heere at meale-tyde, to preise the painefull brethren, or pray that the sweet singers may be restor'd; Sayes a grace as long as his breath lests him: Some time the spirit is so strong with him, it gets quite out of him, and then my mother, or Win, are faine to fetch it againe with Malmesey or Aqua coelestis.[19]

Not only is his name itself a reflection of his character, and it was a common Puritan practice to use such names as Charity, Hope, Patience, Faith, Felicity, but his action is a typical sample of the zeal with which the Puritans entered into all their activities. The fact that Rabbi Busy always arrives at meal time signifies Littlewit's belief that the Puritans actually practiced gluttony.

But the sincere religious beliefs, which make obligatory Busy's opposition to the idleness and extravagance of such amusements as the fair, are not considered by Littlewit and Quarlos; rather, the two men can see only hypocrisy and insincerity in his outspoken condemnations of feasts and entertainments:

> Littlewit--Hee was a Baker, Sir, but hee do's dreame now, and see visions, hee has given over his Trade.
> Quarlos----I remember that too; out of a scruple hee

---

[19] I, ii--64-70.

> tooke, that (in spic'd conscience) those Cakes hee made, were serv'd to Bridales, May-poles, Morrisses, and such prophane feasts and meetings;[20]

Not only is Busy being satirized here for his hypocritical opposition to amusements and ceremonials, but also he is taken to task for his middle class origin. This specific attack is even more strikingly presented in the person of Languebeau Snuff, "a tallow chandler turned Puritan," in Tourneur's The Atheist's Tragedy (1609). The gravity with which this character conducts himself is accentuated in comic effect by the obvious signs of lack of self-assurance; Snuffe is always conscious of himself and feels that every action he makes is being watched and weighed. Not only are his actions humorous, but his speech is that of a man trying to affect learning and assurance he does not possess:

> I salute you both [Charlemont and Castabella] with the spirit of copulation, I am already informed of your matrimoniall purposes, and will be a testimonie to the integritie of your promises.
>
> Fie, fie, fie, these carnall kisses doe stirre up the Concupiscences of the flesh.[21]

In all his attitudes Snuffe reflects his adopted Puritan beliefs: he asserts his love of plainness and simplicity; he avers his bitter hatred of profanity and

---

[20] I, iii--119-24.

[21] I, ii--109-11 and 127-28.

oath-taking; and he exalts truth at every opportunity:

> D'Amville--Mounsieur Languebeau! Happily encountred. The honestie of your conversation, makes me request more int'rest in your familiaritie.
> Snuffe-----If your Lordship will be pleased to salute me without ceremonie, I shall be willing to exchange my service for your favour; but this worshipping kinde of entertainment, is a superstitious vanitie; in plainnesse and truth I love it not.[22]

Snuffe constantly uses the phrase, "in plainness and truth," to express his opposition to extravagance, display, and falsehood. He exhibits an extremely zealous hatred for any kind of profanity, even lecturing D'Amville when the latter threatens to swear.[23] In fact, Snuffe's most prized virtue is what he conceives to be his "purity of conversation." He believes that for this reason he has been used as the perfect vehicle to carry on the love affair between Leuidulcia and Sebastian:

> ...I perceive the puritie of my conversation is us'd but for a propertie to cover the uncleanenesse of their purposes. The very contemplation o' the thing, makes the spirit of the flesh begin to wriggle in my bloud.[24]

The homely metaphor which he employs in this last speech is typical of the attempts he makes to approximate learning, attempts which fail because of the earthiness

---

[22] I, ii--157-64.

[23] I, ii.

[24] IV, i--73-76.

of the metaphors.

Snuffe, like the standard Puritan caricature, also greatly prides himself on maintaining a good reputation in the eyes of the public. For this reason he is very much humiliated when he is found in Cataplasma's house, which has been used for immoral purposes. When accosted by the two judges, he makes a valiant effort to defend himself from their accusations and to aver that he has had no immoral dealings in the house:

> I grant you. The place is full of impuritie. So much the more neede of instruction and reformation. The purpose that caried me thither, was with the Spirit of conversion to purifie their uncleanenesse; and I hope your Lordship will say, the law cannot take hold o' me for that.

Snuffe's concern for the legality of his actions is predominant; as long as he can stay out of jail he feels that his reputation can be repaired. The First Judge seems to be well aware of Snuffe's insincerity:

> No, Sir; it cannot: but yet give me leave
> To tell you, that I hold your warie answere,
> Rather premeditated for excuse;
> Than spoken out of a religious purpose.
> Where took you your degrees of Schollership?
> Snuffe---------I am no Scholler my Lord. To speake
> the sincere truth, I am Snuffe the Tallow-Chandler.
> Second Judge--How comes your habite to be alter'd thus?
> Snuffe---------My Lord Belforest taking a delight in
> the cleanenesse of my conversation; withdrew mee
> from that uncleane life, and put me in a garment
> fit for his societie and my present profession.

Snuffe really seems to believe that the "purity of his

conversation" was responsible for his being appointed chaplain to Belforest; it is his own stupidity (which makes him a perfect tool for his unscrupulous superiors) that he really has to thank for his advancement:

> First Judge---His Lordship did but paint a rotten post;
> Or cover foulenesse fairley. Monsieur Snuffe!
> Backe to your candle-making! You may give
> The world more light with that, then either with
> Instruction or th'example of your life.25

In his attack on Snuffe, the judge is really voicing typical Anglican objections to the Puritan preachers: that they were unlearned, that they were of base origin and crude behavior, and that they relied upon emotionalism to arouse response in their listeners.

Anglican contempt for the Puritan groups was especially severe in regard to the more radical sects;[26] it is presented most openly in Marston's The Dutch Courtesan (1604). In this play Mistress Faugh is a member of the Family of Love; she unashamedly practices prostitution, a profession obviously not in keeping with the religious teachings to which she subscribes. In fact, one is led to the conclusion that her membership in the Family is motivated by her desire for protection

---

25V, ii--53-74.

26The Puritans themselves had a good deal of contempt for the Familists, an attitude not taken into account by the Puritans' opponents.

and for the patronage of the brethren. Of course, the possibility that Marston was satirizing the Family of Love for its supposed practice of "free love" must not be overlooked. In any case, the real character of Mary Faugh is convincingly shown in her conversation with Cockledemoy in the brothel:

> M. Faugh--In very good truthness, you are the foulest-mouth'd, profane, railing brother, call a woman the most ungodly names: I must confess, we all eat of the forbidden fruit, and for mine own part, though I am one of the family of love, and, as they say, a bawd that covers the multitude of sins, yet I trust I am none of the wicked that eat fish o' Fridays.[27]

Her use of Puritan speech, almost clerical in its tone, and her mouthing of Puritan hatred of Catholicism and fasting effectively heighten the satire directed against her by the dramatist. The directness of the satire is also enhanced by setting up a contrast between the frankly vicious Cockledemoy and the pious-speaking but immoral acting Mary Faugh.

Even the grief of the Puritans is often portrayed as insincere; according to the dramatists, death gave the survivors of the deceased an opportunity for emotional demonstrations. This is usually the interpretation of

---

[27] I, ii--14-20.

dramatists using Puritan widows as characters, for these widows insincerely affect grief in order to present a pious appearance to the world. Such is the characterization of Lady Plus in The Puritan or The Widow of Watling Street (1606), a play most convincingly attributed to Middleton.[28] Lady Plus, the Puritan widow, speaks admiringly of her dead husband's religious enthusiasm and his pious manner of living, but there is an undercurrent of contempt for the exaggeration of his religious habits when she says:

> A man that would keep church so duly; rise early, before his servants, and even for religious haste, go ungartered, unbuttoned, nay untrussed, to morning prayer.[29]

Lady Plus does not seem able to appreciate the eagerness of her husband to get to his prayer; moreover, other elements in the play (discussed in another connection) strikingly reveal her insincerity.

Oath, a ne'er-do-well, also makes scathing remarks against the Puritans, but his attack is directed against their hatred of religious ceremonies rather than at their enthusiasm:

---

[28] See Wilbur D. Dunkel, "The Authorship of 'The Puritan,' " Publications of the Modern Language Association, XLV (September, 1930), 804-08.

[29] II, i--p. 268. The play is found in W. C. Hazlitt's edition of The Doubtful Plays of William Shakespeare (London, undated), pp. 249-98.

> You half-christen'd catamites, you ungod-mother'd varlets.[30]

Here satirized are the Puritan refusal to use the sign of the cross in baptism and the denial of the need of godmothers and godfathers for baptized children. It is significant that this opinion comes from a man who is little admired himself, because it then expresses very directly the general public feeling about the Puritans at this time. Moreover, Oath's opinion is supported by Captain Idle, who can see nothing good about them:

> I'd sooner expect mercy from an usurer when my bond's forfeited, sooner kindness from a lawyer when my money's spent, nay, sooner charity from the devil, than good from a Puritan.[31]

However, although the Puritan has here been vilely treated, the fairer opinion of a better class Puritan is expressed by Sir Godfrey Plus when he says to Nicholas, who has been accused of stealing:[32]

> O villain! one of our society,
> Deemed always holy, pure, religious,
> A Puritan a thief! When was't e'er heard?[33]

It can logically be suggested here that Sir Godfrey refuses to admit that Nicholas is a genuine Puritan, that

---

[30] I, iii--p. 257.

[31] I, iv--p. 260.

[32] Nicholas has assumed the identity of a Puritan.

[33] V, iv--p. 297.

he belongs to one of the fringe groups for which the Puritans had little respect. Sir Godfrey would never be guilty of hypocrisy and insincerity himself, and he refuses to believe that a true Puritan could embrace such deceit as Nicholas has.

The appearance of Sir Godfrey in the play is of special significance, for it helps to give a more unprejudiced view of the Puritans. But, as previously suggested, the radical actions and speech of the extremist sects were more easily adapted to satirical use; in one case a play actually borrows its name from one of the most prominent of these sects. This is The Family of Love (c. 1602-07) by Middleton. Even in this play, though, the satire is not entirely confined to ridicule of the doctrines and customs of the Familists, but is directed also against some of the taboos of the large Puritan group. This is more than obvious when Club speaks of the swearing of oaths by the courtiers and gallants; the Puritan attitude toward oath-taking of any kind (except allegiance to God) is accordingly presented vigorously in the words of this apprentice:

> There's nothing, mistress, that is sworn out of date that returns. Their first oath in times past was by the mass; and that they have sworn quite away: then came they to their faith, as, by my

> faith, 'tis so; that in a short time was sworn away too, for no man believes more now than a' sees: then they swore by their honesties; and that, mistress, you know, is sworn quite away: after their honesties was gone, then came they to their gentility, and swore as they were gentlemen; and their gentility they swore away so fast, that they have almost sworn away all the ancient gentry out of the land; which, indeed, are scarce missed,...[34]

Careful examination of this passage reveals an interesting fact; originally, Puritan opposition to swearing was more or less confined to oaths which profaned the name of God. But Club here is concerned with larger matters: the taking of any oath or swearing of any allegiance except to God.

Expressed in normal conversation, the attacks in the play are made doubly effective. The skill of the dramatist is especially clear in the descriptions of the doctrines and ritual of the Family given by the members of the sect themselves and their servants. A good illustration of this is a conversation between Mistress Glister and Club:

> Mis. Glister--Place it here, my honest Club: well done: and how does thy mistress? was she at the Family today? [Club spits.] Spit not(good Club,) I cannot abide it.
> Club----------Not to-day, forsooth; she hath overcharged herself and her memory: she means to use a moderation, and take no more than she can make use of.

---

[34] I, iii--30-41.

> Mis. Glister--And, I prithee, Club, what kind of creatures are these Familists? thou art conversant with them.
> Club----------What are they? with reverence be it spoken, they are the most accomplished creatures under heaven; in them is all perfection.
> Mis. Glister--As how, good Club?
> Club----------Omitting their outward graces, I'll show you only one instance, which includes all other; they love their neighbors better than themselves. 35

Club is obviously referring here to the communal living of the Family and also to the strong emphasis upon brotherly love.[36] But Mistress Glister refuses to accept this generalization by Club, so he is forced to explain in more detail:

> Yes, better than themselves; for they love them better than their husbands, and husband and wife are all one; therefore, better than themselves.[37]

Again the dramatist is directing satire against the supposed practice of free love by the Familists; because Club himself does not understand the implications of the statement he is making, the attack is all the more effective dramatically.

The directness of the satire in the play is maintained by the dramatist's creating constant contrasts

---

[35] II, iv--60-74.

[36] See the discussion of the Family of Love on page 11 of this study.

[37] II, iv--75-76.

between the courtiers and the Familists; through contrast the foibles of both groups are clearly highlighted. It is possible to note, in the conversation between Shrimp, page to Lipsalve, and his master, the shallowness of both the gallant's and the Familist's philosophies:

> Shrimp----But, lord, sir, how you hunt this chase of love! are you not weary?
> Lipsalve--Indefatigable, boy, indefatigable.
> Shrimp----Fatigable, quoth you? you may call it leanable well enough, for I am sure it is able to make a man lean.
> Lipsalve--'Tis my vocation, boy; we must never be weary of well-doing: love's as proper to a courtier as preciseness to a puritan.[38]

The effective use of ticket names in this play is marked; not only are these names applied to the courtiers but also to the Puritans.

Mistress Purge, for example, is "an elder in the Family," and Dryfat, a merchant who is planning to become a convert to the religious organization. How well their names suit them becomes clear in their conversation:

> Mis. Purge--All one with me? dost thou swear too? why then, up and ride!
> Dryfat------Whither away, mistress Purge?
> Mis. Purge--To the Family, master Dryfat, to our exercise.
> Dryfat------What, by night?
> Mis. Purge--O Lord, ay, sir, with the candles out too: we fructify best i' th' dark: the

---

[38] III, ii--19-27.

> glance of the eye is a great matter; it leads us to other objects besides the right.[39]

The Puritan emphasis upon plainness and simplicity is here developed: there should be no ornaments in the churches to distract the attention of the worshippers. Historically, there was precedence for this belief, for in the reign of Edward VI altars, stained-glass windows, and idols had been forcibly removed and destroyed by royal order.

Dryfat seems to agree with Mistress Purge in her condemnation of unnecessary decorations and conveniences in the church when he says:

> Indeed I think we perform those functions best when we are not thrall to the fetters of the body.
> Mis. Purge---The fetters of the body? what call you them?
> Dryfat-------The organs of the body, as some term them.
> Mis. Purge---Organs? fie, fie, they have a most abominable squeaking sound in mine ears; they edify not a whit; I detest 'em: I hope my body has no organs.[40]

Her reaction to the word "organs" is further satire against the Puritan contemptuous attitude toward the music and liturgy of the Anglican service.

---

[39] III, iii--15-24.

[40] III, iii--25-31.

Mistress Purge wishes to be absolutely sure that Dryfat shares the enthusiasm of the Familists for simplicity and devoutness; she assumes the duty of investigating his background and of determining his fitness for membership in the sect. Her questions evoke replies which not only help to satirize the Familists but also illustrate the Puritan merchants' hypocrisy and concern with money-making. There is the pronounced feeling that Dryfat hopes to enjoy the patronage of all the brethren and sisters of the Family when he becomes a member in good standing. He says:

...I desire much to be of your society.

Mistress Purge is delighted with his plain statement of intention and asks him his opinion of the correct and Godly way of life. Purge describes his behavior clearly:

> Yes, I do love to stand to anything I do, though I lose by it: in truth, I deal but too truly for this world. You shall hear how far I am entered in the right way already. First, I live in charity, and give small alms to such as be not of the right sect; I take under twenty i' th' hundred, nor no forfeiture of bonds unless the law tell my conscience I may do't; I set no pot on a' Sundays, but feed on cold meat dressed a' Saturdays; I keep no holydays nor fasts, but eat most flesh a' Fridays of all days i' the week;

> I do use to say inspired graces, able to starve a wicked man with length; I have Aminadabs and Abrahams to my godsons, and I chide them when they ask me blessing; and I do hate the red letter more than I follow the written verity.41

Mistress Purge is especially pleased with Dryfat's glorification of the Puritan opposition to fasting, the strict observance of the Sabbath, the naming of children after Biblical characters, and the seeming sincerity with which he regards Puritan enthusiasm in religious devotion.

But Purge is not entirely happy with his wife's passionate adherence to the Family of Love ; when he knocks for admittance to the meeting house of the sect and identifies himself as a "Familiar Brother," he is told that there is "no room for you nor your familiarity." It does not immediately occur to him that there is a difference between the term that he has used and "a Brother in the Family." Thus, the members' refusal to admit him makes the doctor angry and he rants to himself:

> How? no room for me nor my familiarity? why, what's the difference between a Familiar Brother and a Brother in the Family? O, I know! I made ellipsis of <u>in</u> in this place, where it should have been expressed, so that the want of <u>in</u> put me clean out; or, let me see,--may it not be some

41III, iii--65-78.

> mystery drawn from arithmetic? for my life, these Familists love no substraction, take nothing away, but put in and add as much as you will; and after addition follows multiplication of a most Pharasit-hypocritical crew. Well, for my part I like not this Family, nor, indeed, some kind of private lecturing that women use. Look too't, you that have such gadders to your wives! self-willed they are as children, and, i'faith, capable of not much more than they, peevish by custom, naturally fools.[42]

Purge's diatribe attacks other practices of both the Family and other Puritan groups; he is particularly incensed about the narrow-mindedness of the group in its attitude toward outsiders and the care the Familists take to keep non-believers from witnessing their ceremonies. Moreover, he believes that his wife's outspoken manner has been acquired from the great liberty given women by the Family. This is really an attack on the idea of permitting women to take part in the service much more extensively than they were allowed to do in the Anglican Church. Accordingly, much of the arrogance and aggressiveness of the members of the sect was attributed to the prodding the men received from their wives.

In the same play the resentment of the upper classes toward the successes of the Puritans in commercial affairs is shown by the gallants' r'dicule of the practical trades

---

[42]III, iii--102-16.

in which the reformers excelled:

> Tut, man, the name of a gallant is more hateful to them than the sight of a corner-cap. Hadst thou heard the protestations the wife of a bellows-mender made but yesternight against gallants, thou hadst for ever abjured crimson breeches. She swore that all gallants were persons inferior to bellows-menders, for the trade of bellows-making was very aerial and high; and what were men and women but bellows, for they take wind in at one place and do evaporate at another;--evaporate was her very phrase.[43]

But not only the Puritan emphasis on practicality is ridiculed here; the Puritan manner of speaking in homely metaphors borrowed from everyday occupations of the group is also burlesqued.

This Puritan seriousness of speech, even when extremely plain and sincere, is often satirized in the plays. The quiet kind of enthusiasm, which gave rise to the plain speech and humble actions, is attacked through the characters of the two female Puritans in Middleton's A Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611). A few extracts from their conversation will show this more clearly than a lengthy discussion:

> First Puritan--[To Allwit] Give you joy of your fine girl, sir;
> Grant that her education may be pure,
> And become one of the faithful![44]

---

[43] IV, i--14-23.

[44] II, iii--13-15.

Later she remarks:

> Come, sweet sister; we go
> In unity, and show the fruits of peace,
> Like children of the spirit.[45]

The occasion for the remarks is furnished by Mrs. Allwit's having a baby. This is also the basis for a conversation which ensues among the women who have come to take care of the young mother:

> First Gossip---How is it, woman? We have brought you home
> A kursen[46] soul.
> Mrs. Allwit----Ay, I thank your pains.
> First Puritan--And, verily, well kursen'd, i' the
> right way,
> Without idolatry or superstition,
> After the pure manner of Amsterdam.[47]

To be remarked in these passages is the extremely elevated tone of the language; throughout the play the language of the Puritan speakers seems more appropriate to the church than to the home.

Glorification of pious living in the home is a commonplace in the speeches of the First Puritan, for she is constant in her efforts to praise the Puritan domestic virtues:

> No, believe me,
> A very spiny[48] creature, but all heart;

---

[45] II, iv--11-13.

[46] The word means christened.

[47] III, ii--1-5.

[48] The word means slender.

Well mettled, like the faithful, to endure
Her tribulation here, and raise up seed.[49]

Children are blessings,
If they be got with zeal by the brethren,
As I have five at home.[50]

Her reference to the zeal of the Puritans in all their activities is fittingly accompanied by the zeal with which her own speeches and actions are delivered. But no more fitting comment on Puritan insincerity in their observance of religious discipline was ever made than in this play; for the female zealot becomes intoxicated and falls into Allwit's arms to keep from collapsing on the floor. Her excuse is that her zeal and enthusiasm have overcome her, not the wine that she has drunk!

Puritan seriousness is again ridiculed in Middleton's A Mad World, My Masters (1606). In this play the dramatist satirizes the extreme Puritan reliance upon the Bible and the belief that it was the only book that really mattered. He has the courtesan caution Mistress Harebrain:

---

[49]III, ii--14-18.

[50]III, ii--33-35.

> If he [the husband] chance steal upon you,
> let him find
> Some book lie open 'gainst an unchaste mind,
> And coted Scriptures; though for your own pleasure
> You read some stirring pamphlet, and convey it
> Under your skirt, the fittest place to lay it.[51]

It should be clear from the previous remarks that both extreme enthusiasm and general seriousness could easily be regarded as the artificial and insincere attempts of the Puritans to mask private sins; this was equally true, insofar as the dramatists were concerned, of the piety professed by the reformers. Thus, closely connected with the satire on Puritan enthusiasm and gravity were the dramatic attacks on the dissenters' piety. It should be noted that piety, even more than enthusiasm, emerges as hypocrisy when it is subjected to Jacobean dramatic ridicule; from this point of view, it is easy to see that some of the "enthusiastic" caricatures already discussed also possess elements of hypocrisy. In fact, it is very difficult to find a Puritan caricature in Jacobean drama who is not, at least partially, a hypocrite.[52] But the archtype of all hypocritical Puritans is Rabbi Zeal-of-the-Land Busy in Bartholomew Fair.

---

[51] II, ii--91-95.

[52] One must take care to remember that not all hypocritical characters in the drama of this period are Puritans.

Busy demonstrates his hypocrisy early in the play when he speaks to Dame Purecraft about the possibility of attending the fair in order to eat the famous Bartholomew roast pork:

> Verily, for the disease of longing, it is a disease, a carnall disease, or appetite, incident to women: and as it is carnall, and incident, it is naturall, very naturall: Now Pigge, it is a meat, and a meat that is nourishing, and may be long'd for, and so consequently eaten; it may be eaten; very exceeding well eaten: but in the Fayre, and as a Bartholomew-pigge, it cannot be eaten, for the very calling it a Bartholomew-pigge, and to eat it so, is a spice of Idolatry, and you make the Fayre, no better then one of the high Places. This I take it, is the state of the question. A high place.[53]

Busy is gluttonous enough to wish to eat the roast pork himself, but he must appear reluctant to grant permission to attend a public amusement universally condemned by his religious brethren. Therefore, he attempts to adapt his theology to his convenience by averring that there is no evil in the eating itself but only in the surroundings in which the pork is eaten. That he is not really opposed to gluttony is made clear by the revelation that he has just finished raiding the larder himself.

Busy's rationalization of the possible evil of eating roast pig at the fair is continued; in his verbal

---

53I, vi--48-57. The reference here is to the elaborate ritual and highly decorated churches of both the Catholics and the Anglicans.

exchange with Littlewit and Purecraft, the last-named individuals succeed in getting him to compromise his religious principles still more:

> Littlewit--I, but in state of necessity: Place should give place, Mr Busy, (I have a conceit left, yet.)
> Purecraft--Good brother Zeale-of-the-land, thinke to make it as lawfull as you can.
> Busy-------Surely, it may be otherwise, but it is subject, to construction, subject, and hath a face of offence, with the weake, a great face, a foule face, but that face may have a vaile put over it, and be shaddowed, as it were, it may be eaten, and in the Fayre, I take it, in a Booth, the tents of the wicked: the place is not much, not very much, we may be religious in midst of the prophane, so it be eaten with a reformed mouth, with sobriety and humblenesse; not gorg'd in with gluttony, or greedinesse; there's the feare: for, should she goe there, as taking pride in the place, or delight in the uncleane dressing, to feed the vanity of the eye or lust of the palat, it were not fit, it were abominable, and not good.[54]

Busy's language is pompous and ecclesiastical; it is in the nature of a mask for the unseemliness of his conduct. He speaks against gluttony and greediness, yet practices these vices himself; he is chiefly concerned with keeping his reputation unsullied in the eyes of his companions, not with remaining true to the principles he voices. The greatest effectiveness of the satire results from his own stupidity in not recognizing his companions' clear

---

[54] I, vi--58-79.

allusions to it.

The gravity of his bearing as he walks through the fair with Dame Purecraft, John and Mrs. Littlewit contrasts sharply with the naturalness of the vendors and entertainers about him. Through it all, he possesses a kind of detachment, especially as he cautions his companions to

> Look not toward them, harken not: the place is Smithfield, or the field of Smiths, the Grove of Hobbi-horses and trinkets, the wares are the wares of divels. And the whole Fayre is the shop of Satan! They are hooks, and baites, very baites, that are hung out on every side, to catch you, and to hold you as it were, by the gills; and by the nostrills, as the Fisher doth: therefore, you must not looke, nor turne toward them--The Heathen man could stop his eares with wax, against the harlot o' the sea: Doe you the like, with your fingers, against the bells of the Beast.[55]

He has compromised himself to a considerable extent: he now has preached that the sincere Puritan is noble enough in his faith to carry his own holiness with him, and to wear it as a shield from evil regardless of the place in which he finds himself. From this attitude may be derived the connotation that the fair is not evil to Busy unless he participates directly in the activity of the fair.

Because of the great disparity between his advice

---

[55]III, ii--39-48.

and his own conduct, however, Busy is frequently described as mad;[56] and his strong assertiveness is subjected to much ridicule. He cannot be convinced that his attitude toward the fair is wrong; even when he is being placed in the stocks for upsetting a basket of gingerbread, he defends the "righteousness" of his position:

> I doe obey thee, the Lyon may roare, but he cannot bite. I am glad to be thus separated from the heathen of the land, and put, apart in the stocks, for the holy cause.[57]

To the very end he insists that he firmly upholds the principles of his religion and that his punishment really makes a martyr of him.

Busy has many hypocritical counterparts in other plays; one of the most amusing of these is the previously mentioned Widow Plus in The Puritan. As has been indicated, her husband was the supreme example of Puritan enthusiasm; and she sounds sincere enough in her expression of grief over his death. But her brother-in-law, Sir Godfrey, apparently feels that there is something insincere about her extravagant display of sorrow:

---

[56] That there was some pretense in Puritan behavior cannot be denied. The gulf between principle and practice is satirized in Randolph's The Muses' Looking Glass; see Chapter 3.

[57] IV, vi--85-87.

> Nay, but, kind sister, I could weep as much as any woman; but, alas, our tears cannot call him again. Methinks you are well read, sister, and know that death is as common as homo, a common name to all men. A man shall be taken when he's making water. Nay, did not the learned parson, Master Pigman,[58] tell us even now,--that all flesh is frail--We are born to die--Man has but a time--with such like deep and profound persuasions? as he is a rare fellow, you know, and an excellent reader.[59]

It would be easy to dismiss such a speech as merely consolatory in nature until one examines it closely. Is there any real consolation offered? Because every man must die, should that help Widow Plus to accept her husband's death with less grief? If she really cared about her husband, such clumsy attempts at consolation would have been rebuffed violently.

Actually, Lady Plus cares a great deal more for the pleasures of this world than for the possible rewards of the next; she lacks the spiritual otherworldliness of the sincere Puritan. Thus, while apparently grieving extravagantly for her dead mate, she is ready to accept the suits of the first wooers at hand. These appear in the persons of Nicholas, Oath, Simon, and Frailty, all posing as Puritans; they are described as wearing black

---

[58] The name is satirical of the lower-class origins of the Puritans.

[59] I, i--p. 252. Actually his own remarks satirize the Biblical quality of Puritan speech.

mourning coats, with Bibles at the belts, as if coming directly from church.[60] Middleton has here made fun of both the names of the Puritans and the plain clothing that they wore.

He has done even more; he has revealed the character of these "Puritans" in the ability of Nicholas to twist theology to his own need. This is indicated in the ingenious distinction which Nicholas draws between robbing and stealing; his interpretation is that he can rob because the commandment says, "Thou shalt not steal."[61] This is a direct jibe at the Puritan literal and individual acceptance of the Bible.

His attitude, however, is really no more hypocritical than that of Penitent Brothel in A Mad World, My Masters. The latter character has been a suitor for the love of Mistress Harebrain, a married woman. When she refuses to make a cuckold of her husband for the sake of Penitent, he utters a "sour grapes" speech entirely in keeping with the name the dramatist gives him:[62]

> Ha? read that place again--Adultery
> Draws the divorce 'twixt heaven and the soul.

---

[60] I, ii.

[61] I, iv.

[62] The name itself is sufficient to identify him as a Puritan.

> Accursed man, that stand'st divorc'd from heaven!
> Thou wretched unthrift, that hast play'd away
> Thy eternal portion at a minute's game;
> To please the flesh hast blotted out thy name!
> Where were thy nobler meditations busied,
> That they durst trust this body with itself;
> This natural drunkard, that undoes us all,
> And makes our shame apparent in our fall?[63]

Again the language is clerical, and it is used not to express sincere penitence but dismay at the failure of his plans.

The appropriateness of the name he bears has been suggested; the use of such descriptive names is even more successful in the cases of Tribulation Wholesome and Ananias in Jonson's The Alchemist (1610). These characters have been reserved for final discussion because they contain within themselves all the previously mentioned Puritan characteristics of enthusiasm, hypocrisy, and greed. Thus, Ananias is able to use his religion as a cloak for his covetousness:

> The Spaniard hates the Brethren,[64] and hath spies
> Upon their actions: and that this was one
> I make no scruple. But the holy Synode
> Have been in prayer, and meditation, for it
> And 'tis reveal'd no lesse to them, then me
> That casting of money is most lawfull.[65]

---

[63] IV, i--1-10.

[64] Subtle has previously clearly identified Ananias as an Anabaptist.

[65] IV, vii--73-78.

Since this passage makes it perfectly clear that greed and covetousness primarily motivate the action of the brethren, it is not surprising that both Ananias and Tribulation Wholesome are most concerned about the goods when the raid is made on Lovewit's house:

> Trib.----'Tis well, the saints shall not loose all yet. Goe
> And get some carts--
> Love.---- For what, my zealous friends?
> Ananias--To beare away the portion of the righteous,
> Out of this den of theeves.
> Love.---- What is that portion?
> Ananias--The goods, sometimes the Orphanes, that the Brethren
> Bought with their silver pence.
> Love.---- What, those i' the cellar,
> The knight Sir Mammon claimes?
> Ananias-- I doe defie
> The wicked Mammon, so doe all the Brethren,
> Thou prophane man! I aske thee, with what conscience
> Thou canst advance that Idol against us,
> That have the seale? Were not the shillings numbred,
> That made the pounds? Were not the pounds told out,
> In the eight month, upon the table dormant,
> The yeere of the last patience of the Saints,
> Sixe hundred and ten?[66]

Ananias' last speech is unmistakably intended as a satire of Puritan preciseness, for he attaches exaggerated importance to the details of the contract drawn up between Subtle and the Anabaptists.

Aside from the concern for details, his stupidity is shown by his naive trust in the word of Subtle and Lovewit to carry out the terms of the agreement. They take

---

[66]V, v--90-105.

advantage of him as do the other characters in the play. The supposed Alchemist Subtle and the housekeeper Face, for example, find it very easy to outwit Ananias. His extreme narrowmindedness, as well as his ignorance, is subjected to their laughter; this is especially significant when one considers the comparably lower social status of the belittlers:

> Subtle-- No. Terra damnata
> Must not have entrence in the worke.--Who are you?
> Ananias-A faithfull Brother, if it please you.
> Subtle-- What's that?
> A Lullianist? A Ripley? Filius artis?
> Can you sublime, and dulcefie? calcine?
> Know you the sapor pontick? Sapor stiptick?
> Or, what is homogene, or heterogene?
> Ananias-I understand no heathen language, truely.
> Subtle--Heathen, you Knipper-Doling? Is Ars sacra,
> Or Chrysopoeia, or spagirica,
> Or the pamphysick, or panarchick knowledge,
> A heathen language?
> Ananias- Heathen Greeke, I take it.
> Subtle--How? heathen Greeke?
> Ananias- All's heathen, but the Hebrew.[67]

In this passage is also reflected a common satirical tendency--the portrayal of the Puritans' concern for their religion as only an external thing. Completely disregarding the general religious sincerity of the reformers and their desire to abide by their principles faithfully, the dramatists found great delight in picturing the Puritan as caring only for the respectable outward appearance of his actions. Indeed,

---

[67]II, v--5-17.

Ananias is much more concerned about money at all times than he is about even the external righteousness of his dealings:

> Subtle---O, you are sent from Master Wholsome,
> Your teacher?
> Ananias-- From Tribulation Wholsome,
> Our very zealous Pastor.
> Subtle--- Good. I have
> Some orphanes goods to come here.
> Ananias-- Of what kind, sir?
> Subtle---Pewter and brasse, andirons, and kitchin ware,
> Mettals, that we must use our med'cine on:
> Wherein the Brethren may have a penn'orth
> For readie money.
> Ananias-- Were the orphanes parents
> Sincere professors?
> Subtle--- Why doe you aske?
> Ananias-- Because
> We then are to deale justly, and give (in truth)
> Their utmost valew.[68]

The exclusiveness of the Puritans, and their intolerance for members of the other major religions, are here shown. Ananias' major emphasis on the orphans' religion is thus another indication of his hypocrisy: his real hope is that the orphans' parents were not Anabaptists so that he may make extra money for himself.

Tribulation Wholesome, the Puritan pastor, is also subjected to dramatic ridicule of his insincerity and hypocrisy. Understanding him well, Subtle appeals to the Puritan's sense of cupidity; Tribulation is even made to

---

[68]II, v--49-59.

exhibit interest in alchemy and forget that it is evil if the wicked science will financially benefit him and the cause:

> Subtle--No, nor your holy vizard, to winne widdowes
> To give you legacies; or make zealous wives
> To rob their husbands, for the common cause:
> Nor take the start of bonds, broke but one day,
> And say, they were forfeited, by providence.
> Nor shall you need, ore-night to eate huge meales,
> To celebrate your next daies fast the better:
> The whilst the Brethren, and the Sisters, humbled,
> Abate the stiffenesse of the flesh. Nor cast
> Before your hungrie hearers, scrupulous bones,
> As whether a Christian may hawke, or hunt;
> Or whether, Matrons, of the holy assembly,
> May lay their haire out, or weare doublets;
> Or have that idoll, Starch, about their linnen.[69]

Subtle's remarks throw much light on the manners of the Puritans. He regards all Puritan observances as motivated by the desire for external respectability and proper form. Even the plain clothing of the Puritans, according to him, is not worn from a sincere desire to be humble and plain; and the great importance the Puritans attached to prayers and the saying of grace in the home is attacked:

> Nor shall you need to libell 'gainst the Prelates,
> And shorten so your eares, against the hearing
> Of the next wire-drawne grace. Nor, of necessitie,
> Raile against playes, to please the Alderman,
> Whose daily custard you devoure. Nor lie
> With zealous rage, till you are hoarse. Not one
> Of these so singular arts. Nor call your selves,
> By names of Tribulation, Persecution,
> Restraint, Long-Patience, and such like, affected

---

[69] III, ii--69-82.

> By the whole family, or wood of you,
> Onely for glorie, and to catch the eare
> Of the Disciple.[70]

Tribulation never really flinches under the attack although Subtle has touched upon the leading actions employed by the Puritans. Instead, like the zealot he is, he defends his actions:

> Truely, sir, they are
> Wayes, that the godly Brethren have invented,
> For propagation of the glorious cause,
> As very notable meanes, and whereby, also,
> Themselves grow soone, and profitably famous.[71]

The perpetuation of such insincere and hypocritical practices would appear to be the aim of Tribulation; these aims can best be met by acquiring money through alchemism and carefully hoarding it until it can be of the greatest use to the cause.

The plays discussed have made much of this element of hypocrisy in the Puritan character; this same emphasis is found in other plays which contain effective bits of anti-Puritan satire. Some of these are Chapman's Monsieur D'Olive (1604); Marston's The Malcontent (1604); Tourneur's The Revenger's Tragedy (1606); John Day's Law Tricks (1607); Robert Armin's The Two Maids of

---

[70] III, ii--86-97.

[71] III, ii--97-101.

More-Clacke (1608); Day's Humour Out of Breath (1608); Chapman's The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois (1610); Dekker's If It Be Not Good, the Devil Is in It (1610); Marston's The Insatiate Countess (1610); Fletcher's The Woman's Prize (1611); Middleton's The Mayor of Quinborough (1618); Middleton's Anything for a Quiet Life (1621). The precise point of the satire in these plays is discussed elsewhere.[72]

Being not concerned with fairness of representation but only with effective satire, the dramatists could and did exert the greatest coarseness and directness in their attacks; accordingly, satire against the Puritans was commonly open, even brutal, in the plays of the Jacobean period. The Puritan emerges in the plays as a smug, hypocritical, insincere, biased prig. Unfair as this interpretation appears to have been, it was the prevailing one. As a summation of the typical Jacobean caricature, one might indeed use the picture given by Sir Thomas Overbury in one of his "characters":

A Puritane

Is a diseas'd peece of Apocrypha: bind him to the Bible, and he corrupts the whole text:

---

[72] See the appendix.

> ignorance and fat feed, are his founders; his nurses, railing, rabbies, and round breeches: his life is but a borrowed blast of wind; for betweene two doores, he is ever whistling.[73]

Only as the real strength of the Puritan movement was felt in English public life did the dramatic satire against the dissenters somewhat moderate and become more subtle; no real moderation is felt until the end of the Jacobean period and the beginning of the Caroline.

---

[73]Sir Thomas Overbury, Miscellaneous Works (London, 1856), pp. 80-81.

Chapter Three

Caroline Anti-Puritan Satire

1625-1642

Unlike the directness of most Jacobean anti-Puritan satire, it is clear that in both type and tone the satire of the Caroline period is more varied. Minor dramatists, like Carlell, Brome, Cowley, and Randolph, really show no freshness of approach and are brutally open in their attacks on the Puritans; they might, for all practical purposes, be called Jacobeans. But major playwrights like Shirley and Ford[1] are much more gentle and seem to possess considerable tolerance for the dissenters. (This is somewhat strange when one remembers the continuing Puritan attacks on the stage.) This tolerance cannot, however, in any way be attributed to even a partial identification of interests with the Puritans, for both men were royal favorites. Obviously, the status of the Puritans was improving considerably, and dramatists of the Caroline period had ample reason to recognize the growing power

[1]Ford seemed to feel no great antipathy for the Puritans; Shirley, although a Catholic, respected their morality so much that he did not participate in violent anti-Puritan attacks. See Thompson, op. cit., p. 257.

and prestige of the reform movement and the necessity of compromise with their opponents' beliefs.

The drama is strong proof that they did recognize this need for compromise; instead of presenting violently satirical pictures of the Puritans, as their Jacobean predecessors had done, the major Caroline playwrights included extensive satire of Puritan manners and ideas in characters not clearly Puritan at all. As is true in Restoration drama, certain ideas of the original reformers had come to be identified with a growing religiosity and seriousness in the middle classes. In recognition of this, the Caroline satirists often directed their attacks against "puritanism" rather than "Puritanism."[2] This general tendency is reflected not only in the lesser number of frank Puritan caricatures but also in the decreasing use of ticket-names for Puritan characters.

Equally clear to the student of Caroline drama is the further development of Puritan stage-types. This is largely the result of the wide range of the satire

---

[2]The difference between the terms is easily established: "puritanism" refers to the general moral seriousness of any group or age; "Puritanism" refers to the particular political and religious movement being considered in this study.

employed; refinement and polishing by the dramatists often added other characteristics to the radical enthusiasm of the usual Jacobean Puritan caricature. Thus, certain definite Puritan types held the stage throughout the period: the grasping miser who is defeated by his own cupidity and lack of common sense; the lover of sensuous pleasures in private; the ranting "brother" who attacks anything and everything; and the rationalistic compromiser who revamps his principles to meet the needs of the moment. One characteristic of Jacobean caricatures, however, is retained and even expanded: the exaggerated clerical manner of speaking of the characters. There is hardly a Puritan in Caroline drama who does not speak as if he were in church.

In one category Caroline satire greatly exceeds Jacobean in forcefulness; this is in the direct attack on the political and social activities of the Puritans. Even their attitude toward the theater is the subject of a detailed attack by Thomas Randolph.[3] The satire on these activities is not, however, so much violent or humorous as apprehensive. In the plays of 1641 and 1642, for example, the major dramatists find little humor in the

[3] The Muses' Looking Glass (1630).

actions of the Puritans; rather, playwrights treat their opponents seriously and recognize the grave threat to their position. Some dramatists even come to appreciate openly the justice of the Puritan contempt for existing social evils: Heywood, for example, has actually been accused of being a Puritan because of his pronounced tolerance.[4] The growing moderation of the major dramatists necessarily resulted in more indirectness, and even less sheer fun, in Caroline satire than in Jacobean; one must often probe deep to recognize some of the plays as satirical at all. In fact, only a clear understanding of the characteristics of the Puritan movement will enable one to recognize the great amount of satire produced on the Caroline stage.[5] Aside from the plays discussed at length in the following pages, others contain attacks on the Puritans; in these plays the satire is directed against supposed Puritan mercantile dishonesty (Dekker's Northward Hoe--1635); their love of liquor (William Sampson's The Vow Breaker--1625); their practices common to those of the Jews (Davenport's New Trick to Catch the Devil--1625);

[4] Allan Holaday disputes this assertion in an article, "Thomas Heywood and the Puritans," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XLIX (July, 1950), 192-203.

[5] See Chapter 1 for a definition of Puritanism.

their hatred for the Catholics (Shirley's The Bird in a Cage--1633 and Henry Glapthorne's Wit in a Constable--1639); their dislike of clerical vestments (Glapthorne's The Hollander--1636); their lack of common sense (Brome's The Damoiselle--1638); and their hatred of poetry and the arts (Brome's The Antipodes--1638).[6]

In these plays the satire is only incidental, direct as it is; but the common use of both direct and indirect satire makes the ridicule broader and more inclusive of the feelings toward the Puritans during the Caroline period. The wide range of the satire is itself the clearest expression of the interest the Puritans had aroused in English public life; it is the best proof of the significance of their opposition to extravagance, indecency, and idleness in the theater and the court. The smaller number of individual Puritan caricatures, but increasing number of satirical thrusts at the group, is symbolic of the growing respect the Puritans commanded from their enemies. For this reason the anti-Puritan satire of the period clearly shows the substantial prestige of the Puritan party prior to the Commonwealth.

---

[6]For more details, and for location of the satire within the plays, see the appendix.

In order to establish the continuity between Jacobean and Caroline satire, it is wise to examine first the Caroline use of conventionalized anti-Puritan attacks. It may plainly be seen, for example, that the members of the Puritan party are still very effectively taken to task for their religious seriousness and enthusiasm. Thus, a stage Puritan is always made to speak in extremely elevated tones, lending artificiality to his behavior. His religion is made to supersede in importance everything else in his life, and he is made to profess an elaborate interest in it.

One of the most striking references to Puritan enthusiasm in Caroline drama is found in Massinger's The City Madam (1632), and the emphasis here is on the hypocrisy of the Puritans. Lord Lacy, in speaking of Luke Frugal, gives the conventional opinion that the Puritan was a hypocrite of the worst kind:

> He disguised
> Hypocrisy in such a cunning shape
> Of real goodness, that I would have sworn
> This devil a saint.[7]

That Massinger had the Puritans in mind when conceiving the character of Luke Frugal is shown by the latter's reference to the Puritan belief that the natives of

---

[7] V, ii--p. 336.

America worshipped the devil.[8] Moreover, when Sir John Frugal unmasks his brother Luke, he reveals to the onlookers just how much of a hypocrite this "do-gooder" is:

> What think you now
> Of this clear soul? this honest, pious man?
> Have I stripp'd him bare, or will your lordship have
> A further trial of him? 'Tis not in
> A wolf to change his nature.[9]

Although the satire is sharp enough in this play, it must be remembered that the most direct Caroline attacks on the Puritans are found in the works of the minor dramatists; in fact, in their work no freshness of approach is seen. Accordingly, perhaps the severest satire of Puritan enthusiasm and fanaticism is found in the work of a comparatively minor dramatist who enjoyed great favor with Charles and the queen. In The Conceited Pedlar (1629) Thomas Randolph gives, in the form of a dramatic monologue, his opinion of the Caroline Puritans:

> Next point[10] is a point of false doctrine, snatched from the codpiece of a long-winded puritan; the breath of Arminias will rot in him. Tag him with a piece of Apocrypha, and he breaks in sunder. Truss him to the surplice, and his breeches will presently fall down with the thought of the Whore

---

[8] V, i.

[9] V, iii--p. 338.

[10] Points are tagged laces, commonly used for attaching the hose to the doublet.

> of Babylon. He hates unity and church discipline so far, that you cannot tie a true love's-knot on him; cut off his tags, and he will make excellent strings for a Geneva Bible. I would have these points anathematized from all the religious breeches in the company. 'Tis made of a dangerous stubborn leather, tagged at one end with self-conceit, at the other with wilful opinion. This point is fit for no service, but Lucifer's Cacotruces. But why talk I so long of this point? it is pity it is not licensed.[11]

The pedlar's attack on Puritan enthusiasm contains references to their absolute reliance on the Bible, which he sees as a reflection of their stubbornness, arrogance, and hypocrisy.

Also considered hypocritical was the continuing Puritan opposition to the theater;[12] the most effective satirical use of the attacks on drama was made by Randolph in his The Muses' Looking Glass (1630), the entire play being based upon Puritan objections to the theater as idle and extravagant. In this satire the Puritan protagonists are a Mistress Flowerdew, who sells pins in the theater, and Bird, who sells feathers. Their attack upon the assumed evils of the theater is heightened in dramatic irony by the very fact that they earn their livelihoods by working in the institution they criticize.

---

[11] Thomas Randolph, Poetical and Dramatic Works (London, 1875), I, 42. The edition was prepared by W. C. Hazlitt.

[12] The two most effective printed attacks were the anonymous A Short Treatise Against the Stage Playes of 1625 and Prynne's Histriomastix of 1633.

Parts of this attack are most amusing:

> Flowerdew--See, brother, how the wicked throng and crowd
> To works of vanity! Not a nook or corner
> In all this house of sin, this cave of filthiness,
> This den of spiritual thieves, but it is stuff'd,
> Stuff'd, and stuff'd full, as is a cushion,
> With the lewd reprobate.
> Bird-------Sister, were there not before inns--
> Yes, I will say inns, for my zeal bids me
> Say filthy inns--enough to harbor such
> As travell'd to destruction the broad way;
> But they build more and more--more shops of Satan?
> Flowerdew--Iniquity aboundeth, though pure zeal
> Teach, preach, huff, puff, and snuff at it; yet still,
> Still it aboundeth. Had we seen a church,
> A new-built church, erected north and south,
> It had been something worth the wondering at.
> Bird-------Good works are done. 13
> Flowerdew-- I say no works are good;

The passage serves as a particularly good example of the satire the dramatists used in revealing the seriousness of Puritan speech; it should be remembered that both Bird and Flowerdew are lower class people, yet speak with clerical preciseness. Also significant is Flowerdew's remark about "good works," for she is obviously thinking of the Puritan emphasis on justification by faith alone.

Bird's and Flowerdew's attacks on the theater are completely ridiculous, for they object not to the major shortcomings of the stage but to insignificant details:

> Bird------- Nay, and I have heard,
> That in a tragedy--I think they call it,
> They make no more of killing one another,
> Than you sell pins.

13I, i--pp. 179-80.

Flowerdew-- Or you sell feathers, brother;
But are they not hang'd for't?
Bird------- Law grows partial,
And finds it but chance-medley: and their comedies
Will abuse you, or me, or anybody.
We cannot put our moneys to increase
By lawful usury,[14] nor break in quiet,
Nor put off our false wares, nor keep our wives
Finer than others, but our ghosts must walk
Upon their stages.[15]

The last remarks are the most effective in the play, because they so clearly express actual attitudes toward the Puritans.

It is clear that during the reign of Charles I the plots and dialogue of the Restoration dramatists are anticipated. This is shown by the fact that the Caroline playwrights, like their Restoration successors, criticized the Puritans not only for their public actions but also for their supposed private vices, thus attributing to them a love of sensuous pleasures behind the external sanctity they possessed. Further expressed here is the disgust of the Puritans with the caricatures of themselves on the stage, and the audacity of the dramatists in attacking them is subjected to criticism:

Flowerdew-- Is not this flat conjuring,
To make our ghosts walk ere we be dead?

---

[14]The Puritans were opposed to any real usury, for the lawful rate of interest for Calvinists to charge was three percent. See Knappen, op. cit., pp. 418-20.

[15]I, i--pp. 179-80.

Bird--------That's nothing, Mistress Flowerdew: they will play
The knave, the fool, the devil and all, for money.
Flowerdew--Impiety! O, that men endu'd with reason
Should have no more grace in them!
Bird-------- Be there not other
Vocations as thriving and more honest?
Bailiffs, promoters, jailors, and apparitors,
Beadles and marshal's-men, the needful instruments
Of the republic; but to make themselves
Such monsters! for they are monsters, th'are monsters;
Base, sinful, shameless, ugly, vile, deform'd,
Pernicious monsters.[16]

The piling up of epithets in the last speech is characteristic of the harangues the Puritans delivered against their foes; Bird's mention of other suitable vocations for the actors is extremely effective satire, also, for it satirizes the Puritan objections to idleness. Moreover, the vocations Bird mentions were commonly thought to be those in which the most graft was possible without the danger of being discovered guilty of illegal practices. Thus, the Puritan emphasis upon external respectability is again treated contemptuously.

The satire of the play is enhanced by the appearance of Roscius, a player. Since the players were commonly regarded by the Puritans with as much disapprobation as that with which Bird and Flowerdew regard them, the fact that Roscius, through the logic of his appeal, is able to make the two Puritans admit that there may be some good

---

[16] I, i--p. 181.

in plays if they are instructive is a crushing blow to the whole Puritan attack on the drama. This actually was one of the major arguments of the dramatists and theater managers: that the theater served as a means of instructing the public in correct and modest behavior.[17] The defense, sincere or insincere, was hardly adequate; but it was expressed so vehemently that it drew considerable attention: if the spectators beheld the ridiculous actions of the people on the stage, would they not assiduously try to avoid the display of similar follies in their own lives? Roscius' strong rebuke of Bird and Flowerdew is prompted by this same attempt to justify the stage:

> My spleen is up. And live not you by sin?
> Take away vanity, and you both may break.
> What serves your lawful trade of selling pins,
> But to joint gewgaws, and to knit together
> Gorgets, strips, neckcloths, laces, ribbands, ruffs,
> And many other suchlike toys as these,
> To make the baby pride a pretty puppet?
> And you, sweet feather-man, whose ware, though light,
> O'erweighs your conscience, what serves your trade,
> But to plume folly, to give pride her wings,
> To deck vainglory? spoiling the peacock's tail
> T'adorn an idiot's coxcomb! O dull ignorance!
> How ill 'tis understood what we do mean
> For good and honest! They abuse our scene,
> And say we live by vice. Indeed, 'tis true,
> As the physicians by diseases do,

---

[17] For an interesting discussion of theatrical replies to Puritan attacks, see Joe Lee Davis, "The Case for Comedy in Caroline Theatrical Apologetics," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LVIII (June, 1943), 353-71.

> Only to cure them. They do live, we see,
> Like cooks, by pamp'ring prodigality,
> Which are our fond accusers. On the stage
> We set an usurer to tell this age,
> How ugly looks his soul: a prodigal
> Is taught by us, how far from liberal
> His folly bears him. Boldly, I dare say,
> There has been more by us in some one play
> Laugh'd into wit and virtue, than hath been
> By twenty tedious lectures drawn from sin
> And foppish humours: hence the cause doth rise,
> Men are not won by th'ears so well as eyes.[18]

Not only is the hypocrisy of the Puritans ridiculed in this play, however; also referred to is the well-known fact that many members of the Puritan group were becoming wealthy and powerful through their commerce in articles designed for the luxury trade, articles which the Puritans themselves often condemned as sinful.

Further criticism of the narrowmindedness of Bird and Flowerdew is given in a speech of Roscius about the nature of the play he is going to have them see in the hope of converting them to the actors' and managers' point of view about the theater:

> Flowerdew--[to Roscius] What do you next present?
> Roscius----The several virtues.
> Bird-------I hope there be no cardinal-virtues there!
> Roscius----There be not.
> Bird------- Then I'll stay. I hate a virtue
> That will be made a cardinal: cardinal-virtues,
> Next to pope-virtues, are most impious.

---

[18] I, ii--p. 183. One of the most interesting Caroline theatrical defenses is found in Richard Brathwaite's The English Gentleman (1641).

> Bishop-virtues are unwarrantable.
> I hate a virtue in a morrice-dance.
> I will allow of none but deacon-virtues
> Or elder virtues.[19]

The puns here expressed in regard to "virtues" reflect the intolerance of the Puritans for other religious groups; Bird's fanatical attitude toward Catholicism is Randolph's means of sneering at the intolerance and exclusiveness of the Puritans. While they are always pictured as narrow-minded in the plays, the ridicule heaped upon them here is so exaggerated that it is hardly effective. In fact, the tone of the satire reveals an apprehensiveness on the part of the dramatist.[20]

In addition to his attack on the enthusiastic Puritan opposition to the theaters, Randolph also attacks the Puritan pious code, which encouraged the accumulation of wealth by the individual. The general Puritan statement that such wealth was accumulated solely for the glorification of the brotherhood in the sight of Heaven is thoroughly depreciated in Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery (c. 1626). Goggle, described in the dramatis personae as an "Amsterdam-man," and Carion, a servant to an old gentleman, are talking:

19V, i--pp. 259-60.

20 A good indication of this is Bird's and Flowerdew's ability, later in the play, to see the possible values of the theater as an instrument for teaching morality and good conduct. Their new attitude toward the theater makes them far less stubborn than the usual caricatured Puritans.

> Goggle--Boy, follow me, for I have a zeal to be rich:
> My devotion leads me in the righteous path
> To Plutus, god of wealth. Profane Poverty
> Is a Carthusian and a grand delinquent:
> One o' the malignant party up in arms
> Against the well-affected.[21]

It is a rather strange religious principle that makes Goggle attack the poor orders in the Catholic Church and to identify zeal with the acquisition of wealth. But his enthusiasm for wealth is evidently a very vital part of his religious faith:

> I come to Plutus' conventicle now,
> 'Tis he can cure my troubles; he brings joy
> To the fraternity of Amsterdam,
> To the Geneva brotherhood, and the saints,
> Whose pure devotions feed on Banbury cakes:
> He can restore my wealth, give me abundance
> Of holy gold and silver purified:
> Increase my talents spent upon the Sisters,
> That I may thrive again as did my father,
> That reverend Saint Goggle, Patience Hypomone,
> A holy tailor and a venerable parson.[22]

Carion here interrupts Goggle to ask him if a tailor could be a parson, a remark directed at the humble origin of the Puritan pastors. But Ananias Goggle is not at all deterred by the interruption and answers confidently:

> 'Tis very fit! for first, his sacred parchment
> Can take the measure of religion,
> And from the cloth of a good conscience
> Make up a suit for honest conversation:
> Sewed with the thread of goodness, stitched i' the seams
> With twisted silk of piety and innocence,

---

[21] IV, i--pp. 448-49.

[22] Ibid.

> Lined with good thoughts and charitable actions:
> The sacred shreds and snips of holy carsey
> May chance to mend the garments of the righteous,
> If Satan come to rend their guiltless robes.[23]

The attention Goggle pays to the development of this elaborate simile drawn from common life is extraordinary; his careful analysis sounds like pulpit oratory, and it is unmistakably a satire on just that.

But Carion is not impressed with the speech and is disappointed that he has failed to disturb Goggle's poise through this line of attack; consequently he reverts to his original attempt to get Goggle to reveal his real reason for being interested in money:

> But were you not in miserable condition,
> Before that Plutus came to speak amongst you?
> He speaks with golden eloquence, believe't:
> For now your zealous bags are full again
> With holy silver and good brotherly gold;
> You cannot fall to desperation,
> Having so many angels to defend you.[24]

Carion's use of the adjectives "holy" and "brotherly" to apply to money is again an attack on the wealth being accumulated by the Puritans; his use of the word "angels" has double significance in that these "angels" could be used for bribery, a practice especially associated with the Puritan merchants.

23IV, i--p. 449.

24Ibid.

But satirical as these remarks are, they are mild when compared with others in the same play; for the most vindictive are those found in the conversation among Nevergood, Carion, and Goggle on the occasion of Carion's attempt to get Nevergood and Goggle to fight. Puritan physical characteristics are even ridiculed here, Goggle's nose as well as his snuffle[25] being mentioned. Moreover, any physical threats make him a coward, prompting his reliance on verbal invective for defense:

> Nevergood--So, my good zealous brother of ignorance,
> And what says your Amsterdam nose? You think
> That every man turns factor for the devil:
> A reprobate, that comes not every night
> To hear your fine reformed basketmaker
> Preach in his wicker pulpit? You shall not think
> To have my money thus, you shall not think it.
> Prate any longer here, mutter again,
> And I will make thy pretty brotherly soul
> Come snuffling through thy sanctified nostrils.
> Carion-----Nevergood, I know, was always fierce.[26]

Carion's purpose, as expressed in his own words, is "to make this flesh to have a combat with this furious spirit." Nevergood quickly falls in with the scheme and taunts Goggle about his cowardice, but the latter only answers:

---

[25] "Snuffle" refers to the nasality of Puritan speech; one frequently finds descriptions of Puritans intoning hymns through their noses. This nasalization helped create the rasping quality of voice so often satirized by the dramatists.

[26] IV, i--pp. 452-53.

> I will not fight. It is thy policy to have me fight,
> That I might kill thee, and pollute my hands
> With swinish blood. No, no, I will not fight,
> To make myself unsanctified.
> I will dispute with thee, nose against nose,
> And valiantly I dare to snuffle with thee,
> In the defense of silver purified.[27]

The reference to "snuffling" forms a very effective jibe at Puritan speech, which was generally described as "rasping" in the plays. Nevergood is quick to seize upon Goggle's weak defense:

> Would Plutus had no better champion to defend him
> Than such as only snuffle in the cause!
> I would presume by my own proper valour
> To make a breach in the strongest cupboard,
> Were it as strong as Basing House or Bristol![28]

In spite of all the humiliation he must endure, Goggle refuses to do more than rant; he verbally attacks the hated Catholic practices:

> Avaunt, thou synagogue of iniquity!
> I see thou art of the Popish tribe. Necessity
> Does make thy guts take purgatory penance,
> Brings thee to shrift and shift, makes thy teeth observe
> Unconscionable Fridays, profane fasting-days,
> With Lent and antichristian Ember weeks.[29]

Thus, both Catholicism and Puritanism are satirized in the play, but Puritanism fares the worse since Goggle is made so entirely asinine. This fact becomes even more clear in the following exchange:

---

[27] IV, i--pp. 452-53.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

Goggle-----O sink of sin, and boggard of corruption!
Hast thou no honest calling?
Nevergood--Yes, I have: I know a trick to snuffle at
Bell Alley,
Rail at the steeple-houses and the Popish bishops,
And the tithe-scraping priests, Sir John Presbyters.
Goggle-----Out on thee, villain, foe to the holy cassocks!
I do remember thee in the archbishop's time,
Thou madest me stand i' th' Popish pillory
With Prynne and Burton, only for speaking
A little sanctified treason.30

Goggle is referring to Archbishop Laud, who had almost succeeded in returning England to the Catholic fold during the reign of Charles I. Goggle's hatred is natural, for Charles I and Laud had openly persecuted the Puritans, refusing to compromise with them at all. Prynne's attack on the theater, for example, had resulted in his being placed in the pillory, his ears being removed, and his being barred from the practice of law.[31]

Goggle not only accuses Nevergood of having been partially responsible for this, but he also deplores the lack of zeal in his opponent:

Goggle-----Come, seeing he has no zeal nor ardent love,
Let's strip him naked, till he freezes and grow
As bold as charity.
Nevergood--What, will you plunder me? where's your
warrant, ho?
Do, sanctified thieves, plunder: yet I shall live

30IV, i--pp. 456-57. These remarks may seem out of place in a play dated 1626 since Laud did not become archbishop until 1633. However, the play was revised several times between 1626-1651, and the remarks are obviously later additions.

31 See Hilaire Belloc, Charles, the First, King of England (Philadelphia, 1933), pp. 202-04.

> To see my little Anabaptist come
> To his twelve godfathers, thence to the ladder,
> Where, having nosed a tedious psalm or two,
> The holy hemp must gird your sanctified windpipe,
> While you, in honor of the righteous cause,
> With a wry mouth salute the souls at Paddington,
> And turn a Tyburn saint.
> Goggle-----Pull off his profane and irreligious doublet,
> Anathematize his breeches, excommunicate
> His impious shirt: there's not a rag about him
> But is heretical, full of Babylon lice,
> Like the foul smock of Austria.[32]

Goggle should well be irritated by Nevergood's reference to the Puritans as "sanctified thieves," a means of commenting on their aggressiveness and reputed use of any method, legal or illegal, to obtain commercial success; also extremely biting is Nevergood's reference to Puritan psalm-singing. But the Puritan's reply more than answers his opponent, for it comtains a catalog of abusive words: "profane, irreligious, anathematize, excommunicate, impious, heretical, and foul."

The directness of this attack on the Puritans would be expected in the earlier part of the Caroline period; in the years just prior to the Revolution, however, one would expect even the minor dramatists to tone down their satire and become more subtle. Instead, in 1642, the same year in which the war began, Cowley's The Guardian appeared. This play shows little fear of the Puritan

---

[32] IV, i--pp. 456-57.

opposition, and its attack is far from moderate.

The Puritan widow in the play is primarily concerned about getting her rent from her lodgers and not about their boisterous, indecent behavior. Most brutal are the remarks made by Captain Blade when he is describing the widow:

> Four hundred pound a year cashier'd? Four hundred, by this light, Captain. All my comfort is, that now the usurer's damn'd; and now that niggardly threescore and ten wither'd chap-faln Puritanical thing, his wife, refuses to marry me: I would see her burnt for an old witch before I'd take her for a wife, if she had not Agues, Squinancies, Gouts, Cramps, Palsies, Apoplexies, and two dozen of diseases more than S. Thomas Hospital; and if she live long with all these, I'm sure she'll kill me quickly.33

There is one definitely new accusation in Blade's speech, for it is the first time that the Puritans are directly accused of being usurers: previously this was only suggested, never frankly stated.

The play also contains the usual amount of satire on the enthusiasm of the Puritans and devotes more than the customary attention to the physical characteristics of the reformers. Cutter says to Dogrel:

> You get her? what with that Ember week-face of thine? that Razor of thy nose, those ears that prick up like a Puritanical button-makers of

---

331, ii--p. 164.

Amsterdam?[34]

Later in the play, as Dogrel and Cutter see Tabitha, the Puritan widow's daughter, enter, Dogrel says:

> We shall have him turn Brownist now, and read Comments upon the Revelations.

To which Cutter replies:

> Thou hast hit it, Dogrel: I'le put my self into a rare garbe; Buffe, thou must off, truly Buffe thou must.

Puny then interposes:

> 'Slid a good humour; I could find in my heart to change religion too.

But Cutter effectively puts an end to the jesting when he comments scathingly on Puritan enthusiasm in their religion:

> Pox! no body will change with me, I'm sure. But canst thou put off swearing with Buffe? canst thou abstain in the middle of long grace from crying a plague upon him, the meats cold? canst thou repeat scripture enough to make a Puritan? I'me sure for understanding thou'lt be like enough to any of 'um.[35]

The general ignorance of the Puritans seems to be the real target of attack for Cowley in the play, and how easily the Puritans can be duped is shown by Cutter's subsequent actions.

It is revealed that he has been serious about his

---

[34] I, iii--p. 168.

[35] II, ii--p. 178.

intentions to woo Tabitha; as a means to that end, he dons Puritan garb and affects Puritan mannerisms and speech to facilitate his access to her company. The general lack of firmness of Puritan discipline is shown in the ease with which he is able to convince her to marry him:

> Cutter---And the vision told me, sister Tabytha, that this same day, the twelfth of March, in the year of grace 1641, at this same holy place, by a holy man, we two, who are both holy vessels, should be joyned together in the holy band of Matrimony.
> Tabitha--My mother will be angry, I'm affeard.
> Cutter---Your mother will rejoyce. I would not for a world that you should do it, but that we were commanded from above; yea, I may say commanded: for, to do things without a divine warrant, is like unto the building of a fire without a bottom cake.[36]

Cutter's over-use of the word "holy" is satirical of the sanctimonious Puritan manner; other Puritan characteristics belittled in his speech are: Puritan preciseness, the belief in visions, the acceptance of ever-possible divine intervention in the affairs of men.

But the crowning blow comes when Cutter reveals to Tabitha, after the marriage, that he is not a Puritan. He persuades her to drink several glasses of wine and, through the effects of the alcohol, she is soon converted

---

[36] V, I--p. 220.

to his side and takes part in the merriment in celebration of the wedding.[37] The change in her conduct is so startling that the people around her are astounded. Unable to suppress his curiosity, Captain Blade asks the question for all of them when he addresses Cutter in the following words:

> Prithee, Cutter, what hath exalted Tabytha thus?

To which Cutter answers:

> What? this good fortune she has got by me: You know what a dull creature she was before; her soul was in her body, like butter in a hot cake; now she's as full of Spirits as Hell itself. My counsel and two cups o' Sack, have wrought this miracle.[38]

Thus, dissoluteness and connivance have overcome the supposedly strong religious principles of Tabitha.

Even the more indirect satires of the minor dramatists show little subtlety. Plays such as Thomas Rawlins' The Rebellion (1636) and John Tatham's The Distracted State (1641) are unmistakable warnings to the Puritans of the consequences they might expect from rebellion against the monarch. The first play uses the Spanish and French nations as the background for its plot; the second, more effectively, uses the Scotch rebellion as its center of

---

[37] V, vi.

[38] V, xi--p. 238.

interest. Both plays show a surprising lack of regard for the growing strength of the Puritans.

When the plays just discussed are considered, it is clear that the satire of the minor Caroline dramatists shows no real subtlety; their complete dependence on royal favor made their plays obvious reflections of Royalist sentiment. There was no attempt on their part to take into account the mounting Puritan power. With the major dramatists, who had wider public support and were consequently not as subject to Royalist pressure, the case is different. In their plays the Puritan objections to the idleness, indecency, and extravagance of the nobility are often treated sympathetically. Shirley, for example, in The Witty Fair One (1628), even establishes a striking contrast between the sincerity of Sir George Richley, a rich old knight, and Fowler, the insincere realist who represents the dissoluteness of the gallants.

Fowler points ridicule at Puritan religiosity when he says:[39]

> In all this sermon I have heard little commendations of our dear brother departed; rich

[39]To the objection that there is no certain identification of a Puritan target here, the writer answers: Shirley, being a sincere Catholic himself, would hardly have satirized his own group and his partial dependence on the crown rules out an attack on Anglicanism.

> men do not go to the pit-hole without complement of Christian burial. It seems, if I had lived to have made a will, and bequeathed so much legacy as would purchase some preacher a neat cassock, I should have died in as good estate and assurance for my soul as the best gentleman in the parish, had my monument in a conspicuous place of the church, where I should have been cut in a form of prayer, as if I had been called away at my devotion, and so for haste to be in Heaven, went thither with my book and spectacles.[40]

Fowler's opinion is that all Puritan religious demonstrations are only external, that there is no real sincerity behind any of them. Particularly effective satire is his thrust at the Puritans' regard for the Bible as the only book pointing the way to divine mercy and everlasting salvation.

He also refers to the spiritual otherworldliness of the Puritans; this he regards as morbidness and the principal reason for the gloomy, almost cheerless tone of their faith. But Fowler does not enjoy his creator's real sympathy, for Shirley clearly favors the genuine sincerity of Sir George Richley. This is shown in the directness with which Richley speaks and the lack of exaggeration in his attitude:

> I shall
> Not need to urge your care upon my daughter,

---

[40]V, iii--pp. 355-56.

On whom, next the devotion of my soul
To heaven, all my desires and thoughts reflect.[41]

There is even more convincing proof that Shirley's sympathy was largely with the Puritans, for the dramatist forces Fowler into marriage, the most odious lot a gallant could imagine for himself.

The presence of ideas usually associated with the Puritans indicates Shirley's real appreciation of the basic morality which was a fundamental part of their religion; but at the same time it is obvious that the dramatist somewhat deplores the exaggeration of the Puritans' attitudes in religious matters. An example of the mild type of satire in Shirley's plays is Penelope's speech in The Witty Fair One:

This made
Thy soul sue out so hasty a divorce,
And flee to airy dwellings: [this] hath left us
Thy cold pale figure,
Which we have commission to chamber up
In melancholy dust, where thy own worms,
Like the false servants of some great man, shall
Devour thee first.[42]

Here the attack is on the seriousness and morbidness of the Puritans; but it can, in no way, be compared with the directness of the minor dramatists' attacks on the same qualities. Actually the speech itself, while

---

[41] II, i--p. 277.

[42] V, iii--p. 355.

satirical of Puritan clerical language, sounds relatively sincere.

Shirley also treats the Puritan condemnation of the loose morals of the nobility with considerable fairness; the gentleness of his satire against Puritan moralizing is made clear in Sciarrha's speech in The Traitor (1631):[43]

> What do great ladies do at court, I pray?
> Enjoy the pleasures of the world, dance, kiss
> The amorous lords, and change court breath; sing, lose
> Belief of other Heaven; tell wanton dreams,
> Rehearse their sprightly bed-scenes, and boast, which
> Hath most idolaters; accuse all faces
> That trust to the simplicity of nature,
> Talk witty blasphemy,
> Discourse their gaudy wardrobes, plot new pride,
> Jest upon courtiers' legs, laugh at the wagging
> Of their own feathers, and a thousand more
> Delights, which private ladies never think of.[44]

Of course, Sciarrha's speech is as extreme in its way as the conduct it excoriates, but one would not find a speech so filled with Puritan arguments treated this seriously in Jacobean drama. The speech really takes into account the partial justice of the Puritan attacks on the court, and there can be little doubt that Shirley was thinking of the English court at the time this extravagant harangue was written.

---

[43] This is an example of satire directed against Puritan ideas rather than individuals.

[44] II, i--p. 117.

In the same play the Duke of Florence expresses the basic Puritan idea of the punishment of crimes by the intervention of supernatural powers:

> I am coming, Amidea, I am coming.--
> For thee, inhumen murderer, expect
> My blood shall fly to Heaven, and there inflam'd,
> Hang a prodigious meteor all thy life,
> And when by some as bloody hand as thine
> Thy soul is ebbing forth, it shall descend
> In flaming drops upon thee.[45]

Further gentle satire against the Puritans is found in the condemnatory attack made upon Littleworth and Kickshaw by Celestina, who is described as a "young widow of common sense":

> Yet I will talk a little to the pilchards.--
> You two, that have not 'twixt you both the hundred
> Part of a soul, coarse woollen-witted fellows,
> Without a nap, with bodies made for burdens!
> You, that are only stuffings for apparel,
> As you were made but engines for your tailors
> Tp frame their clothes upon, and get them custom,
> Until men see you move; yet, then you dare not,
> Out of your guilt of being the ignobler beast,
> But give a horse the wall, whom you excel
> Only in dancing of the brawls, because
> The horse was not taught the French way.[46]

The satire is exerted here through the very great exaggeration of Celestina's speech; it is so filled with Puritan enthusiasm as to make one doubt its sincerity and to regard it as nothing more than verbalizing. Moreover,

---

[45] V, iii--pp. 183-84. The elaboration given this figure must have been inspired by the Puritan emphasis on divine intervention. See note 39, page 95.

[46] The Lady of Pleasure (1635), III, ii--p. 61.

the use of illustrations garnered from average middle class occupations reminds the reader of the contempt in which the Puritans were held because of their humble origin. Yet the satire of the Puritans here is comparatively light, for there is considerable justification for these basic criticisms of the gallants.

In addition to a growing respect for the justice of the Puritan attitude toward contemporary society, cognizance of the political power of the reformist movement is found in the plays. An obvious reference to the political situation is found in Ford's The Lover's Melancholy, a play presented as early as 1628:

> Our commonwealth is sick: 'tis more than time
> That we should wake the head thereof, who sleeps
> In the dull lethargy of lost security.
> The commons murmur, and the nobles grieve;
> The court is now turn'd antick, and grows wild;
> Whiles all the neighboring nations stand at gaze,
> And watch fit opportunity to wreak
> Their just conceived fury on such injuries
> As the late prince, our living master's father,
> Committed against laws of truth and honour.[47]

Sopronos' speech clearly summarizes the growing power of Parliament.

The general tendency toward moderation in the satire of the major dramatists is even more pronounced in the plays of the years directly preceding the Commonwealth.

---

[47] II, i--p. 139.

Especially noticeable in these plays are the references to contemporary events; this is still another indication of the fact that the major playwrights respected, and even feared, Puritan political power. In Shirley's The Politician (1639), for example, Gotharus advises the king to forsake his vain and corrupt practices. The reference is obviously meant to warn the court of the strength of the Puritan opposition and of its willingness to use any means to attain its goals:

> ...but let your kingdom suffer,
> Her heart be torn by civil wars, 'tis none
> Of mine! and let him, in the blood of many
> Fathers, be made a king, your king, and you,
> That now command, be taught obedience!
> Creep to your child; exchange your palace for
> A prison, and be humbled till you think
> Death a preferment:[48]

The moderation of the comments on contemporary events is also found in Shirley's The Cardinal (1641); in this play the Duchess Rosaura speaks to the Cardinal about his actions:

> In hope, my lord, you will behold yourself
> In a true glass, and see those unjust acts
> That so deform you, and by timely cure
> Prevent a shame, before the short-hair'd men
> Do crowd and call for justice;[49]

There can be little doubt but that the speech refers to

---

[48] IV, i--p. 140.

[49] II, iii--p. 302.

Archbishop Laud and his blind refusal to see the prestige the Puritan movement was acquiring. The real danger posed by the Puritans must also have been in Shirley's mind when he wrote the King of Navarre's last speech:

> How much are kings abus'd by those they take
> To royal grace, whom, when they cherish most
> By nice indulgence, they do often arm
> Against themselves! from whence this maxim springs:
> None have more need of perspectives than kings.50

It should be noted that this play was presented in 1641 when the Puritan preparations for revolution were obvious to any conscious observer.

The difference between the major and minor dramatists' treatment of the conventional Puritan caricature is thus evident, for the minor playwrights' open bitterness contrasts sharply with the major playwrights' growing tolerance. In one respect, however, there was agreement among all dramatists: this was in the shifting of attack on clearly Puritan characteristics to satire on Puritan principles which were adopted by the English middle classes. This satire is very largely directed against the seriousness, thrift, aggressiveness, and industriousness of the country citizens and their mercantile and professional counterparts

50V, iii--p. 351.

in the city. It has been noted earlier that there is a striking difference between Puritanism and "puritanism."[51] In a sense, the greatest achievement of Puritanism was its bringing of a serious moral tone to the lives of the English middle classes. Accordingly, many people who supported the Puritan party were not Puritans by religion, but only in the way that they recognized the sincerity and justice of the Puritan approach to life.[52]

It was an easy matter for any dramatist to establish a contrast between the lives of the courtiers and the "puritans." Massinger, for example, has pointed out the different attitudes of the two groups by contrasting Sir Giles Overreach,[53] the personification of "puritan" greed, and Lady Allworth, the finest representative of the female courtiers. The basic cleavage of the classes is further established in the contrast between Rhetias, a reduced courtier acting as a servant, and Corax, a physician, in Ford's The Lover's Melancholy. Rhetias follows the conventional practice of condemning the

---

[51] See page 72.

[52] See page 8.

[53] A New Way to Pay Old Debts (1625). For a very complete discussion of the play and the character of Sir Giles, see Robert H. Ball, The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach (Oxford, 1939).

"puritans" for their hypocrisy; Corax, symbolizing the aggressiveness of the middle classes, attacks the courtiers for their lasciviousness and general worthlessness:

> Rhetias--Thou art in thy religion an atheist, in thy condition a cur, in thy diet an epicure, in thy lust a goat, in thy sleep a hog; thou tak'st upon thee the habit of a grave physician, but art indeed an impostorous empiric....
> Corax----The best worth in thee is the corruption of thy mind, for that only entitles thee to the dignity of a louse: a thing bred out of the filth and superfluity of ill humours. Thou bitest anywhere, and any man who defends not himself with the clean linen of secure honesty, him thou darest not come near. Thou art fortune's idiot, virtue's bankrupt, time's dunghill, manhood's scandal, and thine own scourge. Thou would'st hang thyself, so wretchedly miserable thou art; but that no man will trust thee with as much money as will buy a halter; and all thy stock to be sold is not worth half as much as may procure it.54

Rhetias can find no effective retort to the justice of Corax's attack; he attempts to laugh it off, but it is clear that the "puritan" physician really has the better of the argument. Ford has obviously attempted to show the exaggerated seriousness and zeal of the "puritan" middle classes in their new occupations.

In the same play, the old lord Meleander speaks in a manner meant to satirize the new seriousness and gravity brought to the middle classes by the Puritan

54I, ii--pp. 133-34.

movement:

> But I'll outstare ye all! Fools, desperate fools!
> You're cheated, grossly cheated; range, range on,
> And roll about the world to gather moss,
> The moss of honour, gay reports, gay clothes,
> Gay wives, huge empty buildings, whose proud roofs
> Shall with their pinnacles even touch the stars.
> Ye work and work like moles, blind in the paths
> That are bor'd thro' the crannies of the earth,
> To charge your hungry souls with such full surfeits,
> As, being gorg'd once, make ye lean with plenty:
> And when ye have skimm'd the vomit of your riots,
> Ye're fat in no felicity, but folly;
> Then your last sleeps seize on ye; then the troops
> Of worms crawl round, and feast good cheer, rich fare,
> Dainty, delicious.[55]

Not only is the language indicative of "puritan" gravity, but the fact that Meleander is an older man is in itself satirical; for it is always the province of age to rebuke youth for its extravagance. Meleander has acquired "puritan" tendencies very largely because he is no longer physically able to practice the vices of the young courtiers. It is significant that most of the Puritan caricatures in the plays of both the Jacobean and Caroline periods are older people, because their age helps to show the appeal of the Puritan movement to reason as well as emotion.

Aside from these attacks on their moral seriousness, the "puritan" middle classes were also subjected to

---

[55]II, ii--pp. 157-58.

criticism because of their increasing commercial success. That they owed this success to their insistence upon thrift, industriousness, aggressiveness, and zeal was well known; but references to "puritan" business practices in the plays almost always imply some dishonesty on the part of the merchants. Thus the thrift and diligence of the new middle classes are pictured as avarice and greed in the character of Sir John Luke in Massinger's The City Madam:

> A prosperous omen in my entrance to
> My alter'd nature! These house-thieves removed,
> And what was lost, beyond my hopes, recover'd,
> Will add unto my heap; increase of wealth
> Is the rich man's ambition, and mine
> Shall know no bounds. The valiant Macedon
> Having in his conceit subdued one world,
> Lamented that there were no more to conquer:
> In my way, he shall be my great example.
> And when my private house, in cramm'd abundance,
> Shall prove the chamber of the city poor,
> And Genoa's bankers shall look pale with envy
> When I am mentioned, I shall grieve there is
> No more to be exhausted in one kingdom.
> Religion, conscience, charity, farewell!
> To me you are words only, and no more;
> All human happiness consists in store.[56]

What is true of the satire on "puritan" commercial success is also true of their political gains; for middle class methods of obtaining political power are described by Ford's Meleander[57] as hypocrisy, bribery,

---

[56] IV, ii--p. 332.

[57] The Lover's Melancholy.

and dishonesty:

> So politicians thrive,
> That with their crabbed faces, and sly trieks,
> Legerdemain, ducks, cringes, formal beards,
> Crisped hairs, and punctual cheats, do wriggle in
> Their heads first, like a fox, to rooms of state,
> Then the whole body follows.[58]

Never are motives of honesty or just ambition associated with the political "puritans."

Moreover, the covetousness of the group in all affairs is always emphasized. Honesty is only affected for the sake of appearance; according to the majority of the Caroline playwrights, the only really important thing to the middle class citizen is success; any means that will obtain it can be justified. One critic comments on this matter in connection with Richard Brome's The City Wit (1628).[59] The major emphasis in the play is placed upon the attainment of financial affluence; as a matter of fact, commercial success and honesty seem completely incompatible. Consequently, a great deal of contempt is shown toward the honest city man and considerable admiration for the men, usually of a much lower social level, who ruin him. The latter are shown great partiality,

---

[58] IV, ii--pp. 188-89.

[59] Edward K. R. Faust, Richard Brome (Halle, Germany, 1887), p. 51.

even when they are "gay and gross young profligates," who would normally have no claim to the sympathy of the audience.[60]

As the extent of the Puritans' invasion of the wealthy group, and the adoption of their principles by the public, became evident, there were many attempts to improve the social status of the middle classes; one of the most successful of these attempts was the buying of country estates. It is this feature of the Puritan Revolution which has often been indicated as the most significant change in the composition of modern England. Coupled with the acquisition of real property, the vigorous efforts of the middle classes to enter into the occupations and affairs of the court, to win titles in the peerage, to strengthen the position of Parliament, and to secure important governmental posts were alarming to the nobility. In these "puritan" efforts to achieve prestige equal to that of the traditional upper classes the playwrights, however, saw only a crude presumptuousness. In Shirley's The Traitor, for example, Depazzi speaks boastfully of his humble origin and of his success in the city:

---

[60]Herbert F. Allen, A Study of the Comedies of Richard Brome (Palo Alto, 1912), p. 56.

> To return to the dunghill, from whence I came; for though I was born in the city, I have some land in the country, dirty acres, and mansion-house, where I will be the miracle of a courtier, and keep good hospitality, love my neighbors, and their wives, and consequently get their children; be admired amongst the justices, sleep upon every bench, keep a chaplain in my own house to be my idolater, and furnish me with jests;[61]

In sketching his own plans Depazzi is actually expressing the general opinion of the country "puritans'" activities: they lived comfortably, even luxuriously, in private; they practiced immorality behind their respectable doors; they employed chaplains to avoid Archbishop Laud's rules against their meeting for public worship.

Massinger likewise pokes fun at the middle class aspirations to raise themselves into the high ranks of society when, in The City Madam, he directs satire against Mr. Plenty, a new country gentleman with extravagant social aspirations:

> Sir Maurice--You were with Plenty?
> Page---------Yes, sir.
> Sir Maurice--And what answer
> Return'd the clown?
> Page---------Clown, sir! he is transform'd,
> And grown a gallant of the last edition;
> More rich than gaudy in his habit; yet
> The freedom and the bluntness of his language
> Continues with him. When I told him that
> You gave him caution, as he loved the peace
> And safety of his life, he should forbear

---

[61] IV, i--pp. 157-58.

> To pass the merchant's threshold until you,
> Of his two daughters, had made choice of her
> Whom you design'd to honour as your wife,
> He smiled in scorn.[62]

Plenty is made to appear a misfit in the society he wishes to frequent; his wealth cannot compensate for the boorish manners that he still possesses. This resentment of the court circles for the "nouveau riche" classes is still further emphasized by Sir Maurice Lacy's speech to Plenty:

> This only,--thy great grandfather was a butcher,
> And his son a grazier; thy sire, constable
> Of the hundred, and thou the first of your dunghill
> Created gentleman.[63]

Thus Plenty, in spite of his fortunate advancement in a pecuniary manner, finds himself rebuffed by the old social aristocracy.

The same kind of satire is found in other Caroline plays. Lodowick Carlell's The Fool Would be a Favourit(1637) points ridicule at Old Gudgeon, a yeoman, and Young Gudgeon, his son, who tries to buy his way into the court:

> Y. Gudgeon--Old man, I say to thee, be proud, and
> eke rejoyce, to see thy hopefull son salute
> the Duke in triumph, and by him resaluted like
> to an Emperator.
> Duke--------Away ridiculous asse.
> Y. Gudgeon--Did not I tell you?
> Duke--------Get you into the Country to your sheep
> and oxen, those you feed well, will like your
> company, here your Favouritship is growne stale;
> the Court is not so barren, but it brings forth

---

[62] I, ii--p. 317.

[63] I, ii--p. 318.

> daily some new humour, which at first is pleasant, but after, like to yours, grows tedious.[64]

Careful reading of Caroline plays hardly reveals another person as ignorant as Young Gudgeon, who sincerely takes insults as compliments to himself.

It should be clear at this point that the country versus city theme began to develop early in the period, that it was not exclusively a development of the late Caroline or early Restoration periods. In reality, the whole attack on the country is the best evidence of the shift from an attack on Puritanism to a more general satire of "puritanism" in Caroline drama. As the influence of the Puritans grew, certain of their ideas became the common property of the middle classes and the gentry; these ideas are modified and are no longer strictly Puritan although copied from the principles of that movement. This generalized satire was to see further development and refinement in Restoration comedy.

Underlying this change in attitude are the opportunities the dramatists give their stage "puritans" to defend themselves against attack. Sir Thomas Barnwell, in The Lady of Pleasure (1635), thus admirably represents the

---

64V--p. 87.

shrewd practicality of the new English middle class. When he says to his wife that she is too proud and extravagant, the contrast between their ideas reveals the woman's emphasis on externalities and casts considerable doubt on her good sense. Shirley, in this play, has clearly stated the argument between the sincere "puritan" and the one interested only in wealth and external show. Sir Thomas' good sense is revealed in his recognition of the uselessness of great extravagance.

Plenty, in Massinger's The City Madam, is also given a chance to defend himself, but his assertiveness is treated with more humor and is presented satirically:

> I have made my tailor, for my clothes are paid for
> As soon as put on; a sin your man of title
> Is seldom guilty of; but Heaven forgive it!
> I have other faults, too, very incident
> To a plain gentleman: I eat my venison
> With my neighbours in the country, and present not
> My pheasants, partridges, and growse to the usurer;
> Nor ever yet paid brokage to his scrivener.
> I flatter not my mercer's wife, nor feast her
> With the first cherries, or peascods, to prepare me
> Credit with her husband, when I come to London.[65]

Yet there is some justification for the boasting, for the good management and thrift of the country citizens had made them independent.

In the same respect Holdfast, steward to Sir John

---

[65] I, ii--pp. 317-18.

Frugal, belittles the extravagance of the country "puritans" in comparison with the practices of the city:

> Men may talk of country-christmasses, and court-gluttony,
> Their thirty-pound butter'd eggs, their pies of carps' tongues,
> Their pheasants drench'd with ambergris, the carcases
> Of three fat wethers bruised for gravy, to
> Make sauce for a single peacock; yet their feasts
> Were fasts, compared with the city's.[66]

Again the burden of the speech is only partially justified, for it is directed against such senseless extravagance that one wonders where Holdfast draws the line between adequacy and extravagance.

Luke Frugal, who emerges finally as the greatest Puritan hypocrite in all Caroline drama, also is critical of extravagance.[67] With great insincerity and ranting, he criticizes Lady Frugal in a speech reminiscent in tone of some of the sermons preached against vanity and affectation by the Puritan divines:

> Your father was
> An honest country farmer, goodman Humble,
> By his neighbours ne'er called Master. Did your pride
> Descend from him? but let that pass: your fortune,
> Or rather your husband's industry, advanced you
> To the rank of a merchant's wife. He made a knight,
> And your sweet mistress-ship ladyfied, you wore
> Satin on solemn days, a chain of gold,
> A velvet hood, rich borders, and sometimes
> A dainty miniver cap, a silver pin,

---

[66] II, i--p. 320.

[67] For a discussion of his own character, see pages 76-77.

> Headed with a pearl worth three-pence, and thus far
> You were privileged, and no man envied it;
> It being for the city's honour that
> There should be a distinction between
> The wife of a patrician, and plebeian.[68]

Luke Frugal's own hypocrisy, as revealed at the end of the play, makes his denunciation of the faults of extravagance and idleness in Lady Frugal doubly effective as satire. After all, he, possessing the same desire for wealth and power, is in an admirable position to point out the same cupidity in others.

But though the degree of bitterness may vary, Caroline satire maintains the general Royalist contempt for the middle classes. In Ford's The Lover's Melancholy, for example, Amethus expresses great disdain for the members of the commercial group:

> Not like a lady of the trim, new crept
> Out of this shell of sluttish sweat and labour
> Into the glitt'ring pomp of ease and wantonness,
> Embroideries, and all these antick fashions
> That shape a woman monstrous;[69]

Further evidence of this same Royalist contempt is found in the speech of the nobleman Bassanes in Ford's The Broken Heart (1629):

> My birth is noble: though the popular blast
> Of vanity, as giddy as thy youth,
> Hath rear'd thy name up to bestride a cloud,

---

[68] IV, iv--p. 334.

[69] I, iii--p. 135.

Or progress in the chariot of thy sun;
I am no clod of trade to lackey pride,
Nor, like your slave of expectation, wait
The baudy hinges of your doors, or whistle
For mystical conveyance to your bed-sports.70

It is evident that the dramatists' chief objections to the "puritan" middle classes were that their success could be directly traced to industriousness and aggressiveness, qualities noticeably lacking in the nobility and upper classes. The successes of the merchants and country gentlemen came to be considered offenses against the traditional ruling circles.

But the most significant examples of the seriousness with which the Puritans (and "puritans") were regarded by the major dramatists is not found in the plays at all; it is Shirley's elaborate masque entitled The Triumph of Peace. Although lying outside the province of tragedy and comedy, this masque is important because it attacks the advantages given to the Puritans by awarding them "monopolies" in various commercial areas. Written in 1634, Shirley's strong attack on the Puritan country gentlemen, lawyers, artisans, physicians, and seamen[71] was undertaken

70III, ii--p. 278.

71The writing of this masque does not indicate Shirley's vacillation between hatred and toleration of the Puritans; after all, this masque was commissioned by the Inns of Court. See Thompson, op. cit., pp. 179-80.

as an answer to Prynne's Histriomastix (1633), the most voluminous of the Puritan attacks on the theater and court.[72] That Shirley had royal permission for this work is proved by the fact that Attorney Noy, who had the most extensive knowledge of the trade monopolies, took an active part in the writing of the antimasque of "the projectors."[73] The directness of the attack in this masque is worth noting, for the Puritans had often availed themselves of the laws in regard to monopolies; in fact, many of them had become wealthy through the monopolies granted them by the crown.

The shortsightedness of royal policy, and its vacillating nature, aided the Puritan struggle for power. By 1640 it must have been clear to any thinking person that the reformers' day of triumph had arrived. Thus, the clear recognition of the Puritan position is expressed in the prologues to plays of the years of 1641 and 1642. The prologue to Shirley's The Sisters (1642) makes the feeling of alarm evident:

---

[72] For an interesting article on the work and influence of Prynne, see Thomas R. Lounsbury, "A Puritan Censor of the Stage," Yale Review, n.s. XII (July, 1923), 790-810.

[73] Whitelock's Memorials (London, 1853), I, 54.

Does this look like a Term? I cannot tell;
Our poet thinks the whole town is not well,
Has took some physic lately, and, for fear
Of catching cold, does not salute this air.
But there's another reason, I hear say,
London is gone to York: 'Tis a great way.
Pox o' the proverb, and of him, say I,
That looked o'er Lincoln! 'cause that was, must we
Be now translated north? I could rail, too,
On Gammer Shipton's ghost, but 'twill not do;
The town will still be flecking, and a play,
Though ne'er so new, will starve the second day.
Upon these very hard conditions,
Our poet will not purchase many towns;
And if you leave us too, we cannot thrive:
I'll promise neither play nor poet live
Till ye come back.[74]

---

[74]These lines should be compared with the following lines from the prologue to Cowley's The Guardian (1642):

Who says the time do learning disallow?
'Tis false; 'twas never honored so as now,
When you appear, great Prince, our night is done:
You are our Morning-Star, and shall b'our Sun.
But our scene's London now, and by the rout
We perish if the Roundheads be about:
For now no ornament the head must wear,
No bays, no mitre, not so much as hair.
How can a play pass safely, when we know,
Cheapside-cross fails for making but a show?
Our only hope is this, that it may be
A play may pass too, made extempore.
Though other arts poor and neglected grow,
They'll admit Poetry, which was always so.
Besides the Muses of late have been
Sanctified by the verse of Master Prynne.
But we condemn the fury of these days
And scorn as much their censure as their praise.
Our muse, blest Prince, does only on you rely;
Would gladly live, yet not refuse to die.

The last words were not less than prophetic, for in the same year Parliament issued an ordinance suppressing all stage plays; five years later an even stricter statute was passed. The following year, 1648, saw the passage of legislation in which all the existing playhouses were ordered demolished, all players to be seized and whipped upon apprehension, and any person detected attending a play to be fined five shillings.[75]

There can be little doubt that the widespread use of anti-Puritan satire in Jacobean and Caroline drama helped to inspire the Puritan attacks on the theater.[76] In particular, the wide range of Caroline satire must have greatly angered the reformers; for Caroline drama not only attacks the conventional characteristics of enthusiasm, hypocrisy, greed, and boldness, but also the extent of the Puritan influence on the English middle classes as well as their successes in business, commerce, and politics. Moreover, Caroline dramatists did what

---

[75]The whole controversy between the Puritans and the stage is discussed in Thompson, op. cit. For an account of the limited dramatic activity during the Commonwealth, see John Leslie Hotson, The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage (Cambridge, 1928); see also Louis B. Wright, "The Reading of Plays During the Puritan Revolution," Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 6 (November, 1934), 73-108.

[76]Puritan anger at the dramatic attacks against them is expressed in the Refutation of Heywood's Apology for Actors (1612), in the anonymous Short Treatise Against the Stage Playes (1625), and in Prynne's Histriomastix (1633).

Jacobean dramatists had not dared to do: they had made actual comments on contemporary events which involved the Puritans.[77] Also the wide range of the satire is evident in tone as well as in targets attacked; it ranges from excessive and open bitterness in the minor dramatists to gentle, indirect sneering in the major ones. The overtones of contempt are thus more adequately expressed, for the degree of opposition to the Puritans varied in actual practice. Because of this variation in tone, Caroline drama more clearly shows the influence of Puritanism in English life than did Jacobean drama.

The particular contribution of Caroline drama which was to be most important in the Restoration period was the growing attack on the "puritanism" of the middle classes; its principal significance stems from the fact that middle class adoption of Puritan principles in a sense constituted the clearest popular sanction of the Puritan cause. The result was that the attack on "puritanism" was to be one of the most important ingredients in Restoration anti-Puritan satire.

---

[77] The absence of comments on contemporary affairs in Jacobean drama is certainly not owing to the absence of such events. Such events as the Millenary Petition of 1603 and the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 would have made excellent material for attack. James I's own partial identification with Calvinistic doctrines may partially explain the absence of such attacks.

This is only another way of saying that the development of the satire was progressive; each period offered something new in subjects and dramatic targets. Thus, it may be strongly averred that the use of the Puritans as targets for satirical attacks had only begun in 1642; it was to be revived and expanded during the Restoration, a period of strong counter-reaction against the rigid discipline of the Commonwealth. The nature of Restoration satire will be revealed in the following chapter.

Chapter Four

Restoration Anti-Puritan Satire

1660-1700

Reviewing the evidence found in Jacobean and Caroline plays, it is obvious that anti-Puritan satire developed in a continuous line from the Elizabethan dramatists; only the Puritan rule during the Commonwealth temporarily interrupted its progress. Thus, resemblances in the drama of the Jacobean, Caroline, and Restoration periods are marked: in Restoration drama, for example, one finds a continued attack on Puritan enthusiasm, hypocrisy, immorality, and intolerance. One also finds the usual references to the pious speech, severe clothing, long noses, and the "gadly sneer"[1] of the dissenters.

This study has shown that at the beginning of the century the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists had felt no compunction about satirizing the Puritans openly; in their plays the characters often appear on the stage designated in the dramatis personae as Puritans. Toward the latter part of the Jacobean period, however, the growing power of the reformers made caution necessary,

---

[1] This term is frequently used in Restoration plays to distinguish the nasal quality of Puritan speech, previously identified most frequently as "snuffling."

and the playwrights began to ridicule men who had adopted occupations and trades in which the Puritans had distinguished themselves. Moreover, the increasing middle class acceptance of Puritan ideas led to more subtle satirical treatment of lingering "puritan" principles. The tendency to satirize seriousness, zeal, and sanctity was motivated during the Caroline and early Restoration periods by the presence of broader "puritan" ideas rather than by dislike of the specific practices of the Puritans. This shift in treatment was very largely forced upon the dramatists by the growing public awareness of the justice of the Puritan cause.

As an effective means of attacking this general seriousness and enthusiasm, the Restoration dramatists continued Caroline practices: these were the establishment of dramatic contrasts between the behavior and speech of the "puritan"middle classes and the courtiers and the special accentuation of the contrast between the court and the country characters. The latter contrast becomes such a staple ingredient in the plots of the Restoration comedies that one is often tempted to see satire of Puritanism where none exists,[2] and the safest

[2]One must remember the difference between Puritanism and "puritanism."

policy is to attribute many of the satirical remarks in the plays to the dramatists' hatred of the narrow-mindedness and social backwardness of the "puritan" countryside. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Restoration playwrights were always seeking a "golden mean" between the excessive zeal of the country and the affectations of the court. For these reasons, only in cases where the characters are identified as Puritans or as citizens "knighted by Oliver" (or similar direct descriptions) can one be sure that a direct attack on Puritanism is intended.

The really significant contribution of Restoration comedy to anti-Puritan satire is also a continuation of a tendency found in Caroline drama, but the Restoration dramatists far outdo their predecessors: this is in the direct political satire against the Puritans. In the 1680's, for example, the attacks upon the political activities of the Puritans during the Commonwealth are brutally frank. The bitterness of these attacks is clearly the result of the regrouping of the Puritan elements of the nation into the new Whig party. Proof of this is found in the production of such plays as Durfey's Sir Barnaby Whigg (1681).

It may be conjectured that the very fairness of the Puritan position is what most angered the opposition; now that the Royalists were in control, profligacy and drunkenness became the accepted rules of courtly behavior. A desire for revenge superseded all considerations of the possibly greater effectiveness of a moderate attitude toward the Puritans. Not only were the regicides punished, but all known Puritans were regarded with disfavor. Sharing in the favor of the court, the dramatists necessarily adopted the same attitude toward the dissenters and pictured them as generally despicable. It should be noted here that there is often a tendency to attribute the anti-Puritan satire of the Restoration entirely to the return of the monarchy;[3] this is a false assumption, for previous discussion has made clear that there was an entire gallery of Puritan caricatures available to the neophyte dramatist and that he recognized the effectiveness of earlier attacks on the Puritans. What the royal sanction of drama did was to encourage the dramatists to revive the attacks which had been so

---

[3]The great outburst of anti-Puritan satire at the Restoration is too well known to require comment here; the dramatists' smoldering ashes of hatred burst into open flame when all restrictions on their activity were removed.

successful in the earlier periods.[4]

For the most part, few new facets are added to the Puritan character. Wycherley, it is true, has his Alderman Gripe[5] duped by a whore, a somewhat worse indignity than any to which the Puritans had been subjected in earlier satires; and no other dramatist had been so brutal in attacking supposed Puritan sham and artifice. But Alderman Gripe is little more than the conventional stage Puritan; he is essentially only an individualized personification of vice and cupidity. A smug, self-righteous, hypocritical Puritan, his god is chiefly money and his byword is "privacy in sin." His constant concern is for his good appearance in the eyes of the world; he admittedly has sexual desires but hopes to satisfy them in private. This leads him into the hands of the two bawds at Mrs. Crossbite's house; when there is a threat to his reputation, he sadly parts with five hundred pounds. His own statement well summarizes the general opinion of him: "I love privacy in opposition to the wicked who hate it."

But his cupidity is even worse than his lust. When

---

[4]The best study of Restoration comedy is Bonamy Dobree's Restoration Comedy (Oxford, 1924).

[5]Love in a Wood (1671).

he is left alone with Mrs. Joyner and Lucy, he wishes Joyner to leave so that he can carry out his intended rendezvous with Lucy. Mrs. Joyner does not intend to leave until she has received payment for her work in bringing about the clandestine meeting:

> Gripe---Again entertaining! we will be to each other a Feast....but come, if you will have me as extravagant as the wicked; take that and fetch us a Treat, as you call it.
> Joyner--Upon my life a Groat, what will this purchase?...A Treat of a Groat, I will not wag!
> Gripe---Why don't you go? here, take more money, and fetch what you will; take here, half a Crown.
> Joyner--What will half a Crown do?
> Gripe---Take a Crown then, an Angel, a Piece; be gone.[6]

Wycherley is not content to punish Gripe through making him pay the five hundred pounds previously mentioned, for a final indignity is heaped upon the Puritan alderman. In order to save both his honor and his fortune, it is necessary for Gripe to marry Lucy. Thus, unlike any other stage Puritan, he is not only duped by a whore but is also forced to marry her. Adding to the effectiveness of this harsh treatment is the fact that Wycherley places Gripe in the center of the play's action; he is not relegated to a place in the underplot.

In other respects Wycherley is somewhat different from

---

[6]III, iii--pp. 112-13.

most dramatists attacking the Puritans. Principally, he does not confine his satire to the Puritans; in fact, as a dramatist he comes to be the enemy of insincerity and hypocrisy of all kinds.[7] Both The Plain Dealer (1676) and The Country Wife (1675) have an excessively bitter tone not usual in the comedy of manners genre. Wycherley reflects the attitude of the large English public toward moral behavior. Neither Puritan rigidity nor Royalist libertinism was acceptable to the average citizen; a moderate course somewhere between the two extremes was the desired goal. Wycherley is in perfect accord with this aim, and he is realistic in the sense that he has an intimate knowledge of the shallow courtly world and the morally better Puritan world, and transfers his vivid impressions of these extremes to his plays. The dominant element in all his plots is, consequently, the Restoration sermonizing against extremes of all kinds. Because of his desire to present the situation fully, he is often accused of not individualizing his characters, of making them stage-types in almost every instance. But this charge is, at best, made sincerely only by those who do

[7] His mature life is a record of revolt against extremes of all kinds in social behavior; see Willard Connely, Brawny Wycherley (New York, 1930).

not understand the function of the comedy of manners.

It must be remembered that Restoration aristocracy enjoyed having its foibles published in detail before the world,[8] but insisted that dramatic caricatures be generalized so that no individual might be said to resemble any of the characters on the stage. Also the Puritan opposition was still strong; the later Collier controversy is only one instance of its strength. Thus, in ridiculing both courtiers and Puritans, it was necessary to confine the attack to the class rather than to the individual. The very reason that Cowley's The Guardian (1642) was at first suppressed has been conjectured to be that it left the class level for the individual;[9] the revised Cutter of Coleman Street (1661) did not encounter this difficulty since the play was written during a liberal regime.[10] The explanation is interesting, for it lends support to this writer's surprise at not finding a single case of individual caricature in Jacobean, Caroline, and

---

[8]The broadsides published during the Restoration show this concern for personal anonymity as well as the utter lack of concern for the reputation of the group.

[9]Most dramatic critics have mentioned this supposition, but none has definitely proved that a specific Puritan individual was attacked.

[10]For this reason the latter play is much more openly satirical of the Puritans.

Restoration plays. Individualized satire may have been intended in the plays of the 1680's, but only the Cromwells are identified and they are definitely not caricatured. It is also true that Prynne is attacked in Caroline drama often, but he does not appear as a Puritan caricature in the plays of that period. While other characters may have been intended as caricatures of the dramatists' Puritan contemporaries, none of these has been identified. Obviously, the Puritan group was powerful enough to protect its members from individualized attack even during the Restoration. The comedy of manners provided the perfect medium for this generalized attack.

In any consideration of Wycherley's use of the Puritans his most personal play must be considered. In The Plain Dealer Manly is Wycherley and is used as a mouthpiece by the dramatist. Manly cannot logically be classified as a Puritan caricature, but he does have certain "puritan" traits. He is dissatisfied with the world about him and probably expresses the dramatist's own interest in reforming society. He despises hypocrisy and dishonesty wherever it is found. In fact, his ranting is much like that the playwrights attributed to

the Puritan preaching brethren.[11]

When one considers the sham and hypocrisy of the stage Puritans, it is immediately evident that Manly could not have been regarded by Wycherley as a Puritan caricature; for Manly is himself the arch enemy of all sham and hypocrisy. Rather, Manly is used by the dramatist to express his contemptuous attitude toward both the courtiers and the Puritans for their radical behavior. Thus, Manly's conversation with Freeman is a direct attack on the stubbornness and pride of the Puritans and the courtiers alike; it is, moreover, a fine example of satire against the futility of even trying to reform a society which stopped at nothing to justify its behavior:

> Freeman--And no Professing, no Ceremony at all in Friendship, were as unnatural and as undecent as in Religion; and there is hardly such a thing as an honest Hypocrite, who professes himself to be worse than he is, unless it be yourself; for, though I cou'd never get you to say you were my Friend, I know you'll prove so.[12]

Freeman is obviously referring to the plainness of the Puritan religious practices and their dislike of idols and church ornaments. But he is also pointing out the

---

[11] See Act I, Scene 1, for a sample of Manly's ranting.

[12] I, i--pp. 109-10.

impossibility of being completely honest and frank as Manly seems to be.

It has been stated that Manly serves as Wycherley's mouthpiece in the play for many of the dramatist's observations on the hypocrisy of the Puritans and the courtiers; it would then logically be expected that he would escape satirical attack himself. This is far from the truth, for Manly emerges one of the most unhappy in a galaxy of unhappy characters at the end of the play. Against sham and hypocrisy even such a sincere man is helpless. Moreover, he has been duped by Olivia, who is an obvious Puritan caricature as shown by her railing against the very pleasures that she loves.[13] Eliza rebukes her for this hypocritical attitude:

> Eliza---That you pretend an aversion to all Mankind in publick, only that their Wives and Mistresses may not be jealous, and hinder you of their conversation in private.

The attack continues even more bitterly:

> Eliza---That you condemn the obscenity of modern Plays, only that you may not be sensur'd for never missing the most obscene of the old ones.
> Olivia--Damn'd World!
> Eliza---That you deface the nudities of Pictures, and little Statues, only because they are not real.
> Olivia--O, fie, fie, fie; hideous, hideous, Cousin! the obscenity of their Censures makes me blush.[14]

---

[13]There can be no reasonable doubt about Olivia's identification as a Puritan after one hears her Puritan attacks on the theater and arts.

[14]V, i--p. 177.

In addition to being hypocritical, Olivia has absolutely no moral scruples; she attacks anything and everything that gives her an opportunity to put on a false show of modesty in public. She violently attacks the plays because she really enjoys them; if she did not want herself associated with the theater-going crowd, she would take care to keep her presence at the performances unknown. Her biggest interest in life, like that of many other Puritan caricatures, is money; for it she will give anything. She is concerned with her reputation in the sight of others but cares little to be at peace with her own conscience. She is squeamish about external appearances but delights in obscenities of all kinds, an interest which she would never acknowledge to anyone else. She is, in reality, a "synthesis of social vices."[15]

In addition to being deceived by Olivia, Manly has been betrayed by Vernish, the only man in the world he had really considered a friend. Only Fidelia serves as a kind of consolation to Manly, and this consolation is not acquired until after he has somewhat modified his principles of nonconformity. Moreover, in order to adhere to his principles at all he has to withdraw from

---

[15]Henry T. E. Perry, The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama (New Haven, 1925), p. 52.

society and attack its evils from a distance. He is made to appear ineffective in his social criticism, for it takes only the form of verbalism; there is no serious effort on his part to exert his energies in the direction of constructive reform. While he is not a Puritan caricature, his actions form effective satire against Puritanism; for his inability to fight the hypocrisy of Olivia reveals just how hypocritical the whole Puritan movement was in Wycherley's eyes.

It is in his isolation and verbalism that Manly approaches most closely the Puritan caricatures of other dramatists; although he is Wycherley's mouthpiece and serves as a commentator on the extremes of behavior of both the courtiers and the Puritans, he does possess the characteristics of those Puritans who withdrew from city social life into the safety of the country. The country Puritan is actually encountered more frequently in Restoration plays than is the mercantile, political, or religious type. This is not only owing to the withdrawal of many dissenters into the country in order to avoid detection, but also to their determination to continue to practice their religion in comparative freedom. Even the pronounced financial and social success of the

rural Puritans greatly irritated their opponents.[16]

The theme of the withdrawn Puritan (or "puritan") is a common one in Restoration drama. In two of Shadwell's plays it may be seen used as the central plot. The Sullen Lovers (1668) presents the characters of Stanford and Emilia, both morose and melancholy and "tormented beyond measure with the impertinence of people, and resolved to leave the world to be quit of them." Stanford's speeches in the play are those of the caricatured "puritan," who can only rant without doing anything effective in the way of social reform. A misanthrope like Manly,[17] Stanford is more obviously a "puritan" in that his interest in isolation begins while he is still a member of society. He thus becomes a clear caricature of a citizen who sought security from his enemies by leaving the city and establishing himself in the country.

Stanford's feminine counterpart, Emilia, has much the same opinion of society, an opinion which she expresses clearly throughout the play.[18] The obvious

---

[16] See Chapter 3, pages 115-16.

[17] The connection between these characters and Moliere's Alceste has been greatly exaggerated.

[18] See especially Act II, Scene 1.

similarity of views between Stanford and Emilia prompts Lovel to try to make a romantic match between them. Their conversation, when the plot to bring them together has succeeded, is typical of Puritan complaints against the dissolute aristocracy of the Restoration period:

> Emilia----Now the qualifications of a fine Gentleman are to Eate A-la-mode, drink Champaigne, Dance Jiggs, and play at Tennis.
> Stanford--To love Dogs, Horses, Hawkes, Dice and Wenches, scorne Wit, breake Windows, beat a Constable, ly with his Sempstress, and undoe his Taylor; it distracts me to think on't.[19]

The social vices and follies attacked are those which the Puritans particularly condemned, and their attitude toward the poets and dramatists is not neglected either. Stanford is made to say, for example:

> All of ye; ye are a pack of the most insupportable Fools that e're had breath; I had rather be at a Bear-Garden then be in your Company.[20]

In spite of this extreme attitude, neither Stanford nor Emilia is treated unkindly by Shadwell; they are married and plan to effect their retirement into the country at the end of the play, and no great ridicule is heaped on either of them throughout the five acts. Rather, Shadwell seems to feel sympathetic toward them because they

---

[19] II, iii--p. 38.

[20] III, i--p. 42.

appear to have some sincerity. He has no admiration, on the other hand, for the old "Country Gentleman," because the latter is a real Puritan hypocrite.

Yet there is a certain element of cowardice in Stanford's and Emilia's attitudes; it is always easier to withdraw from the world than to remain a part of it and exert constructive action from within society. The reader is left with little hope that these characters' retirement into rural seclusion will bring any real improvement to the world; he is forced rather to the conclusion that both Stanford and Emilia are designed to show Shadwell's contempt for verbal reformers. But the sense of moderation in the dramatic attack in this play is reminiscent of Shirley and Ford.

Enthusiasts of all types were generally despised by the dramatists, whose opinions of sincere moralists range from satire about the devout citizen and country gentleman to attacks on the chaplains attached to many households. In the latter respect, it is profitable to examine the remarks about Smirk in Etherege's The Man of Mode (1676):

> O. Bell.--Out a pine! the Canonical hour is almost past; Sister, is the man of God come?

L. Town.--He waits your leisure--
O. Bell.-- [to Smirk] By your favour, Sir. A Dod, a pretty spruce fellow! what may we call him?
L. Town.--Mr. Smirk! my Lady Biggots Chaplain.
O. Bell.--A wise woman! a Dod, she is. The man will serve for the flesh as well as the spirit.[21]

The use of ticket names is effective, for both Smirk and Lady Biggot are the kinds of characters their names indicate. The attack on the immorality of the chaplains is illustrative of the hatred against the Puritans for the support of clergymen in their own homes to avoid the rules against other than Anglican religious meetings.

Another amusing caricature of such a chaplain is that of Roger Bull in Vanbrugh's The Relapse (1696). The most interesting part of this satire is the pompousness of the language in which Bull speaks:

Bull---I hope, Sir, my Character will be consider'd; I am Heaven's Ambassador.
Coup.--Are not you a Rogue of Sanctity?
Bull---Sir (with respect to my Function) I do wear a Gown.[22]

Young Fashion has succeeded in bribing Bull and the nurse to testify that his marriage to Miss Hoyden is genuine. A telling stroke of satire is that which makes Bull willing to do so if he receives personal advantages. Still other caricatures of Puritan religious leaders are Parson Dunce,

---

[21] V, ii--189-96.

[22] V, iii--p. 87.

"formerly a farrier and fled from England," in Aphra Behn's The Widow Ranter (1689) and Ananias Goggle, "a lay elder," in The Roundheads (1681) by the same writer.[23]

But most of the satire against the rural people is more severe than the just-quoted attacks against the chaplains; typical of this more radical satire is Etherege's She Would if She Could (1668). In this play Sir Oliver Cockwood, a country knight, violently satirizes the strong "puritan" principles which continued to remain dominant in the rural areas even after the Restoration:

> Well, faith, a man had better be a vagabond in this Town, than a Justice of Peace in the Country: I was e'ne grown a Sot for want of Gentlemanlike recreations; if a man do but rap out an Oath, the people start as if a Gun went off; and if one chance but to couple himself with his Neighbours Daughter, without the help of the Parson of the Parish, and leave a little testimony of his kindness behind him, there is presently such an uproar, that a poor man is fain to fly his Country:[24]

It is worth noting here that the attack seems to be on lingering "puritan" principles in the country and that such an attack is especially significant since it points out the indisputable fact that not all of England was

---

[23] The name of this character is taken directly from Jonson's The Alchemist.

[24] I, 1--79-87.

indulging in the extravagantly immoral acts of the Restoration court.

The same kind of attack on lingering "puritanism" is found in Durfey's A Fool's Preferment (1688), but it is handled differently. In this play Justice Grub, "an old peevish Country Justice, an hater of the town, and its fashions," is made to mouth the "puritanical" principles in his attack on Cocklebrain:

> You are a Jack-pudding, a Pragmatick Spend-thrift, a Fellow that I would beat into a Powder, if I had the Law on my side. Can there come anything of Essences, Pulvilio's, and Perfumes, more than the Head-Ach? Take your Wife to task, ye Blockhead, and Thrum her Jacquet well, she'll ne'er be good else.[25]

His speech has the moral tone of the Puritan caricatures developed in Jacobean and Caroline drama, and his attack is primarily directed against the extravagance of the social circles of his time. His strong "puritanism" is shown even more clearly by his attack on the theater:

> Look you into the Park, or into your Damn'd Play-house, and see what Crowds of Female Sins come thither, and then let's hear you prate.[26]

But perhaps the most effective satire in this play is expressed in still another manner. When Grub hears of

---

[25] I, ii--p. 26.

[26] I, ii--p. 27.

Cocklebrain's preferment by the king, he makes attempts to win preferment for himself, thus demonstrating that all his raillery against the city and the court has been sheer hypocrisy and insincere verbalizing.

Similar ridicule against the boorishness of the rural citizens is used in Etherege's Love in a Tub (1664). Sir Nicholas Cully is described in the dramatis personae as "knighted by Oliver,"[27] so one may be sure that a direct attack on the Puritans is intended here. As a matter of fact, however, Cully has completely deserted real Puritan principles; he loves whoring, drinking, and gambling, and is completely deceived by Wheedle and Palmer, two gamesters. After being knighted, he has come to regard himself as a cavalier. Being in debt for one thousand pounds as a result of his gambling and extravagant living, he decides to take the cavalier's method of solving this problem: this simply means that he decides to court the widow in order to get the money he needs. The following conversation between Wheedle and him illustrates Wheedle's lack of scruples:

> Sir Nich.--And what think you of this Habit? is it not very modish?
> Wheedle----As any man need wear: How did you furnish your self so suddenly?

27This obviously means Oliver Cromwell.

> Sir Nich.--Suddenly? I protest I was at least at sixteen Broakers, before I cou'd put my self exactly into the fashion; but now I defie Sir Frederick; I am as fine as he, and will be as mad as he, if that will carry the Widow, I'le warrant thee.
>
> Wheedle----Is it not better pushing thus for a Fortune, before your Reputation's blasted with the infamous names of Coward and Gamester? and so become able to pay the thousand pounds without noise, then going into the Country, selling your Land, making a havock among your Woods, or mortgaging your Estate to a scrupulous Scrivener, that will whisper it into the ears of the whole Town, by inquiring of your good behaviour?[28]

But the best is yet to come: his affectation of the manners of the gallants is so extreme that he over-acts the part and frightens the widow away.[29] Further abuse is heaped on him, as a representative of the rural Puritans, when he comes on the stage in an intoxicated condition. Seeing him, Betty, waiting-woman to the widow, says of Cully:

> 'Tis one of Oliver's Knights, Madam, Sir Nicholas Cully; his Mother was my Grand-mother's Dairy maid.[30]

Her short speech effectively belittles Cully's pretensions by referring to his lower class origin.

In the same scene Cully says in his drunken manner:

---

[28] IV, ii--11-27.

[29] Act IV, Scene 3.

[30] V, ii--25-26.

> Sir Frederick! Widow, bid him welcome; he is a very good friend of mine, and as mad a fellow as my self. Kiss, kiss the Widow, man; she has a plump Under-lip, and kisses smartly.

Sir Frederick Frollick cannot hide his surprise at both Cully's speech and actions:

> What's here? Cully drunk, transform'd into a Gallant, and acquainted with the spring and proportion of the Widows lips![31]

While the attack on Cully is humorously aimed at the country Puritan, Shadwell's The Squire of Alsatia (1688) bitterly attacks the principles of the rural "puritans." The chief contrast in the play is that of country versus city education, but the satire is really directed against the strict country discipline rather than specifically against the Puritans as a class. It is noteworthy that Sir William Belfond, in this play, is forced to admit that his cloistered raising of his son is wrong.

Shadwell's treatment of the country versus city theme should be compared with Sedley's development of the same subject. In The Mulberry Garden (1668) the contrast between urban and rural mannerisms is found in the characters of Sir John Everyoung and Sir Samuel Forecast. Forecast, like Sir William Belfond in Shadwell's play, believes in the strictest of discipline in

---

[31] IV, ii--96-102.

raising children. His daughters are subjected to the most rigid controls while Everyoung's daughters are treated with the greatest of liberality. Yet, while Forecast in this play is an obvious "puritan," it is interesting to observe the censure which is heaped on Everyoung as well. Both men are actually employers of extremes, and Sedley follows the conventional trend in Restoration drama of advocating moderation in all things.

Affectation is the vice to which the dramatists chiefly objected, for it had become a prevalent disease in the social circles of the time. Wycherley's The Gentleman Dancing Master (1672) is a good example of the dramatic treatment of affectation in that the play exhibits satire against the artificial adoption of French and Spanish customs. Moreover, Don Diego's plan of keeping his daughter in seclusion until a satisfactory marriage has been arranged is reminiscent of Sedley's Forecast and Shadwell's Sir William Belfond. Don Diego has many characteristics of the country "puritans" in that he insists on keeping his daughter away from the city and the social gatherings of the court. His Spanish habits are strangely mixed with his "puritan" ideas, and

attributing his behavior entirely to his adoption of foreign mannerisms is not sufficient to explain the attitude he displays in his relations with his daughter Hippolita. If the interpretation just suggested is accepted, Don Diego in reality becomes a very effective "puritan" caricature; for in his actions and speeches is portrayed a liking for the very foreign affectation the Puritans themselves so strongly disliked.

In the seclusion of his own estate, he can practice these odd habits to his entire content. Like Shadwell's The Squire of Alsatia and Sedley's The Mulberry Garden, this play may then be considered a satire directed against the Puritan principles which had been adopted so readily by the rural middle classes. In all plays of this type the "Puritans'" backwardness in social matters is ridiculed with great effectivoness, but it is interesting to note that even through the burlesque there emerges a recognition of the practicality of the country folk in the management of their affairs and their unconcern with the trivialities of social decorum. There can be little doubt that the court's and city's ridicule of the country was very much prompted by real envy of the rural group's success in commercial and financial affairs.

Always the rural people are ridiculed for their boorishness, and often they are treated as complete fools. Such is the case with Sir Joseph Wittol in Congreve's The Old Bachelor (1693). An essentially foolish person, he is tricked out of a hundred pounds by Sharper, who claims that he lost that amount in rescuing the country knight from a band of attackers. Sir Joseph gives Sharper a note for one hundred pounds to be paid to Fondlewife, the usurer. His cowardice is indicated when Captain Bluffe tries to convince him that he should ask for the return of the note:

> No, no hang't, I was not afraid neither--Tho' I confess he did in a manner snap me up--Yet I can't say that it was altogether out of fear, but partly to prevent mischief--for he was a devilish cholerick Fellow: and if my Choller had been up too, agad there would have been mischief done, that's flat. And yet I believe if you had been by I would as soon have let him a' had a hundred of my Teeth. Adsheart, if he should come just now when I'm angry, I'd tell him--Mum.[32]

The contrast between Captain Bluffe's aggressiveness and Wittol's cowardice heightens the satire directed against both. Probably Bluffe's uncouth manners and his willingness to fight on the slightest provocation are intended as sneers at the earnestness of the Puritan

---

[32] III, iii--p. 192.

soldier, for the wound of the Royalist defeat was still keenly felt. In this connection another caricature of a Puritan soldier should be mentioned: this is Colonel Buff, "a blunt old soldier of the last age," who appears in Durfey's Squire Oldsapp (1678).

Other interesting caricatures of the country citizens are found in the characters of Sir Tunbelly Clumsey and Sir John Friendly in Vanbrugh's The Relapse (1696) and in the character of Sullen in Farquhar's The Beaux' Stratagem (1707). The fact that such characters appear in the plays at the beginning of the Restoration period and continue to be used in the plays of the early eighteenth century is some indication of both their popularity with the audience and of the extent of lingering "puritan" principles in the country.

It should be obvious from this discussion that most of the treatment of the Puritans (and "puritans") in the plays thus far examined has tended to place them at one side or other of center; this is strange when one recalls that the doctrine of moderation seemed to be the golden rule for which everyone was seeking. The real reason for the lack of moderation in the plays is that the playwrights are reproducing the immoral attitude

of the monarch and his court; clearly the lavish splendors of that establishment could hardly conceal the total lack of any emphasis upon sexual morality.[33] The morals and conduct of society had reached a new low, and there was no attempt to hide the lasciviousness of the age from the public.

The sincere opposition of the Puritans to this gross violation of propriety[34] angered the dramatists; accordingly, pride and stubbornness are particularly associated with the Puritans as they appear on the Restoration stage. In addition, it may readily be ascertained from examining the plays that what the majority of the anti-Puritan satirists really disliked most about the Puritans was their zeal in religion, trade, and politics. It must be admitted that such zeal easily lent itself to burlesque in the plays; the greedy, grasping, morbid Puritan is thus thrown into sharp contrast with the young rakes who have no decency but do often have the virtue of being honest. In fact, a defense often offered for the young men of fashion in the plays is that their

---

[33] Dobree, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

[34] Puritan attacks on the theater and court culminated in Jeremy Collier's A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage (1698). The strong progress of "puritanism" is marked in the fact that Collier was an Anglican by profession.

actions may be excused because they are so thoroughly honest with themselves and others; they actually serve as dramatic foils against which the other characters may be revealed in high relief. The assumed Puritan sham and hypocrisy emerge from such comparison in an even more lurid light.

Thus, barring the contempt of both Shadwell and Wycherley for the verbal reformers, the conventional stage Puritans of Jacobean and Caroline comedy persist in the plays of the Restoration. A good example of the normal Restoration caricature is Shadwell's Old Maggot in A True Widow (1678). He is described in the dramatis personae as "an old credulous fellow, a great enemy of wit, and a great lover of business for business' sake."[35] His entire life is directed by his cupidity. He objects to poetry and all the arts because he feels that there is nothing financially profitable to him about any of these pursuits. The ridicule heaped on him for his exaggerated interest in the making of profits is largely conveyed through the contrast which the dramatist establishes between his nephew and him. Led into marriage with Mrs. Cheatly through his passion

---

[35]This description alone is sufficient to identify him unmistakably as a Puritan.

for money, he has urged Young Maggot into marriage with one of her daughters. His dismay when he is informed that Lady Cheatly is a fraud is worth quoting:

> Ounds! I am cheated, undone, and my Nephew ruin'd, and married to a Beggar.[36]

Lump, in the same play, is described as "a methodical blockhead, as regular as a clock, and goes as true as a pendulum; one that knows what he shall do every day of his life by his almanac, where he sets down all his actions beforehand: a mortal enemy to wit." He is not only one of the most delightful, but also one of the most comprehensive Puritan caricatures in Restoration drama. He professes religion, admitting himself that he does so chiefly for the advantages this profession brings him in business:

> Lump------I wish you had set up in the City among our Party, and gone to Meetings, it might have been a great advantage; I my self have made much benefit of Religion, as to my temporal Concerns, and (so long as it be directed to a good end) it is a pious fraud, and very lawful.
> L. Cheat.-No Brother, The godly have two qualities, which would spoil my design; great Covetousness (which would make 'em pry too narrowly into our Fortune) and much Eating (which would too soon devour what I have left.)
> Lump------Reproach not the godly, Lady Sister, I do not like it. [37]

---

[36] V, i--p. 360.

[37] I, i--p. 299.

The emphasis upon legality in this conversation is another conventional element in Restoration anti-Puritan satire; the Puritans were pictured as using religion and the law as cloaks to cover their unscrupulous dealings. Also referred to is the matter of Puritan gluttony, a common subject for attack.

Lump also exhibits the hypocrisy of the Puritans as portrayed in the plays:

> Lump--------What pleasure can there be to hear Fellows scrape upon Cats-guts? There's nothing in't.
> L. Cheat.--'Tis the way to get credit at our end of the Town, as singing Psalms, and praying loud in a fore-Room, is at yours.
> Lump--------You talk not wisely; do not several godly men by those means, and by frequenting Meetings, get credit enough to break out for a hundred thousand pound, and are made by it for ever.[38]

The Puritan emphasis upon utilitarianism is here given striking dramatic expression. Most of Lump's pious objections to the theater, and to what he describes as "abominations and sins," are made upon this basis: that they in no way contribute to the commercial and financial success of the brethren. In voicing his opposition, he is often made to speak like a Puritan preacher,[39] and

---

[38] III, i--p. 316.

[39] See Act IV, Scene 1.

at the end of the play he is made to say:

> Be godly, observe method, and be wise.[40]

Fondlewife, the banker in The Old Bachelor, adds stupidity to the other features of the Puritan caricature. Bellmour dresses himself in a Puritan clerical habit in order to have access to Fondlewife's wife Laetitia. His remarks at this time are directed against the hypocrisy and false piety of the Puritans:

> Bell.---'Tis pretty near the Hour--Well and how Setter hae, does my Hypocrisy fit me hae?...
> Setter--O most religiously well Sir.
> Bell.---I wonder why all our young Fellows should glory in an opinion of Atheism, when they may be so much more conveniently lewd, under the Coverlet of Religion.[41]

Fondlewife's extremely suspicious attitude toward his wife is indicative not only of his jealousy and fear of being cuckolded, but also of his great delight in the sexual pleasure she affords him. This is clearly evidenced in his preaching to her in a melodramatic manner, the sarcasm being increased by the fact that she is already carrying on an affair with Bellmour:

> Wife--Have you thoroughly considered how detestable, how hainous, and how crying a Sin, the Sin of Adultery is? Have you weigh'd it I say? For it is a very weighty Sin; and

---

[40]Many examples of this type of speech are found in Act V, Scene 1.

[41]IV, i--p. 197.

> although it may lie heavy upon thee, yet thy Husband must also bear his part; For thy iniquity will fall upon his Head.[42]

Particularly amusing is the greater concern he attaches to the effects of her adultery on him rather than on her.

Other thoroughly conventional Puritan caricatures are Scrapewell in The Squire of Alsatia and the Country Gentleman in The Sullen Lovers. Shadwell, in each of these characters, has ridiculed the religious enthusiasm of the Puritans. Scrapewell is described as a "hypocritical, repeating, praying, psalm-singing, precise fellow, pretending to great piety, a godly knave." The chief characteristics of the Country Gentleman are his gravity and his constant use of proverbs in speaking and writing.

It should be clear from the foregoing remarks that, in spite of their general agreement on conventional methods of satirizing the Puritans, the Restoration dramatists differ widely in their individual treatment of the reformers. Surprisingly enough, but perhaps because of his Puritan origin, Dryden has very little to do with the satire directed against the dissenters.

---

[43]IV, i--pp. 198-99.

Congreve's Puritan caricatures are entirely conventional; they show little originality and may be traced to their origin in the comedies of Sedley and Etherege as well as their Jacobean and Caroline predecessors. With Shadwell and Wycherley, however, the case is different. Wycherley, probably the greatest comedy writer of the Restoration, shows the most bitterness of the dramatists attacking sham and hypocrisy. Thus, in The Country Wife and The Plain Dealer, the characters in high society fare little better than the Puritans as dramatic caricatures. They are violently attacked for their sham, hypocrisy, indecency, and extravagance as well as for their emphasis on external show. In a sense, Shadwell treats the Puritans more unfairly than Wycherley because they bear the brunt of his attack; but, with the exception of Lump, most of the Shadwellian caricatures are rather gently drawn.

It will probably surprise many readers to find that Puritan caricatures are very largely found only in the comedies of the Restoration period, but a brief discussion of the scope of the tragedies should help to diminish that surprise. The tragedy of the Restoration was an exotic plant growing in a neo-classical hothouse. It

was governed by the so-called Aristotelian unities of time, place, and action (or supposedly governed by these considerations); it was not realistic but romantic in treatment. It did not deal with the common people but with the upper classes, especially the nobility. There was the extravagantly brave hero, possessor of all the virtues, and in love with a fair maiden equally virtuous. Odds meant nothing to this hero; the greater the odds, the greater the chance for bravery. The plots of the plays, furthermore, dealt with remote historical periods; even a cursory examination of some of the most popular of them confirms this statement. In such exotic and unrealistic plots, references to Puritans and their affairs would have been completely out of place, for the Puritans did not exist as an organized class during the periods to which the plays refer.

Moreover, the use of foreign settings in the heroic plays encouraged the employment of Catholic characters. Since the plays were set in exotic countries where Catholic governments were usually in control, the Puritans would have been entirely out of keeping with any kind of atmospheric unity. In a sense, this was a kind of dramatic tribute to the Puritan's practicality as a man

of business; he is seldom pictured as stupid in his business affairs, as stupid as he may be personally and socially. He is too intelligent and practical to associate himself with exotic and risky foreign adventures. He is primarily concerned with the development of England as a great commercial country, and his interests are accordingly directed toward the increasing prosperity of the domestic economy. It has been mentioned earlier that in Calvinism may be seen the real foundations of modern capitalistic business practices, practices which rest on careful computation of profit and loss, on expansion with confidence into larger operations, on the emphasis given to economy and self-reliance, and on fair and honest dealings for the most lasting success. All these factors in the operation of a respected business were fundamental parts of the Puritan way of life;[44] as a stage type, the caricatured Puritan largely retains these traits even though they are exaggerated and distorted. For although Puritan thrift, honesty, piety, and industriousness are portrayed as hypocrisy and covetousness, the Puritan caricatures are not involved in the malicious plots frequently

[44]See Chapter 1, pp. 16-19.

assigned to the Catholics.

That there was some appreciation of the sincerity of Puritan dislike for Catholicism and Anglicanism is proved in one play of the period in which both the Puritan and his opponents are effectively ridiculed; this is Crowne's Sir Courtly Nice (1685). Hothead, in this play, seems to possess both Anglican and Catholic traits, but his fanaticism identifies him more closely with the latter group; Testimony also appears to be a blend of two groups, the Puritan and the Anglican, but is more a dissenter than a churchman. Actually the whole religious struggle among the Puritans, Anglicans, and Catholics is here shown as a rather futile thing through the fanaticism of both characters. Being fanatics, both lack the ability to rationalize their differences and to find some common ground for compromise; their names admirably suit their personalities as is illustrated in the following passage:

> Hothead-----You are an impudent rascal to call me poor soul. Sirrah, I have a loyalty and a good conscience, and that's a better estate than any of your party have; and if you live in the house with me, I'll settle it on you, with a pox to you.
>
> Testimony--Yes, Mr. Hot-Head, I know you well enough. I know you would hang us all if you could.

> Hothead----I need not, sirrah, for Heaven be prais'd now you begin to hang your selves. I knew when Tyburn was bestow'd upon the priests and Jesuits, the fanatics and republicans wou'd not be long without it, for they are very fond of all Church lands. Come, sirrah, if you live here, I'll make you turn over a new leaf, I'll make you go to Church, sirrah.[45]

They continue their ranting, each refusing to see the other's point of view. They even enter into an argument as to the respective merits of the ministers of the faiths. In this case Testimony perhaps has the better of the dispute, for he at least attends his church and knows what the preachers are like. The satire here is on Puritan enthusiasm; as a matter of fact, there is a direct reference in this play to the Acts of Allegiance and Supremacy. Hothead says:

> Sirrah, I'll cram the oaths of allegiance and supremacy into you, and they'll stick in your throat, though treason wont, and so I'll to a Justice presently.[46]

The dialogue between Hothead and Testimony occasionally becomes very heated:

> Test.--I have authority.
> Hot.---You authority?
> Test.--Yes, from my Lord.

Testimony's remarks reflect the usual Puritan reliance

---

[45] I, p. 265.

[46] III, p. 302.

on God's authority.

But Hothead completely ridicules his opponent's sincerity:

> Hot.---You had it then out of his kitchen, sirrah. the beef o'the nation breeds all the maggots in the people's heads. I am sometimes tempted to throw down their porridge-pots, and spill the divine right of Presbytery. In short, my Lord is a man of honor, and you have belied him, sirrah.
> Test.--It is well known I make a conscience.
> Hot.---Ay, you rogues, making o'consciences is a great trade among your party, and you deserve to lose your ears for it.[47]

Hothead's reference to the making of consciences is an attack on the Puritan belief that man is guided by the divine will and that man must follow this will if he is to be saved. It is, moreover, a satirical comment on the assumed externality of Puritan religious disciplines. In spite of the strength of these attacks on the Puritans, however, it would be difficult to judge whether Hothead or Testimony has the better of the argument. In the final instance, for example, Hothead does succeed in overcoming Testimony in a scuffle, but the Puritan gets the last word anyway:

> Persecution--persecution--Papist--do--kick the Godly, kick the Protestants out o'th'kingdom--do Papist--I see what you would be at.[48]

---

[47] II, pp. 283-84.

[48] V, p. 352.

The speech is reminiscent particularly of Jacobean drama in which the Puritan is often pictured as enjoying persecution because it gives him a chance to show the magnitude of his faith in God and the Bible.

Aside from the development and refinement of this Jacobean and Caroline satire, the Restoration dramatists added one significant new attack; this is the direct attack on the political activities of the dissenters during the period of the Commonwealth.[49] In Durfey's Sir Barnaby Whigg (1681), for example, the title character is described in the dramatis personae as "A Phanatical Rascal, one of Oliver's Knights; one that always pretends to fear a change of government, yet does his best to cause one." The political "turncoatism" of the Puritans is displayed in Whigg's change from Puritanism to Catholicism and then to Mohammedanism in the hope of bettering his fortunes. In another of Durfey's plays, The Royalist (1682), Sir Oliver Oldcut, a Puritan official, is described as "Chairman to the Committee of Sequestration, a busy Factious Fellow."

---

[49]For an interesting discussion of this most active period of political satire on the stage, see George R. Whiting, "Political Satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83," Modern Philology, XXVIII (August, 1930), 29-43.

(Another interesting character is Sir Paul Eitherside, who is a "Justice of the Peace, and Orator, that takes bribes on both sides." He is Puritan or Royalist, according to which side is more beneficial to him personally.) Under Sir Oliver Oldcut's orders, Sir Charles Kinglove's estates have been taken from him. These estates are later ordered restored by Cromwell. At the end of the play it is announced that Cromwell is ill and that the times will change. In addition to these Puritan characters and the references to Cromwell and his activities, the play also contains the Puritan figures of Sir John Zounds, Sir Peter Codshead, and Alderman Thrum.[50]

But the play reserved for final discussion is, in many respects, the most significant of all for the historian of satire because it contains within itself practically every kind of attack directed against the Puritans from the stage during the entire seventeenth century; this play is Aphra Behn's The Roundheads (1681). The prologue, spoken by the ghost of Hewson, a Committee-man and former cobbler, is so important that it must be

[50]For a good discussion of Durfey's plays, see Robert S. Forsythe, "A Study of the Plays of Thomas Durfey," Western Reserve University Bulletin, Vol. XIX, No. 5 (May, 1916).

quoted in its entirety:

I am the ghost of him who was a true son
Of the late good old cause, ycleped Hewson,
Roused by strange scandal from th'eternal flame
With noise of plots, of wondrous birth and name,
Whilst the sly Jesuit robs us of our fame.
Can all their conclave, tho with Hell th'agree,
Act mischief equal to Presbytery?
Look back on our success in forty-one,
Were ever braver villainies carried on,
Or new ones now more hopefully begun?
And shall our unsuccess our merit lose,
And make us quit the glory of our cause?
No, hire new villains, rogues without remorse,
And let no law nor conscience stop your course;
Let politicians order the confusion,
And let the Saints pay pious contribution.
Pay those that rail, and those that can delude
With scribbling nonsense the loose multitude.
Pay well your witnesses, they may not run
To the right side, and tell who set 'em on.
Pay 'em so well, that they may ne'er recant,
And so turn honest merely out of want.
Pay juries, that no formal laws may harm us,
Let treason be secured by ignoramus.
Pay Bully Whig, who loyal writers bang,
And honest Tories in effigy hang:
Pay those that burn the Pope to please the fools,
And daily pay right honourable tools;
Pay all the pulpit knaves that treason brew,
And let the zealous sisters pay 'em too;
Justices, bound by oath and obligation,
Pay them the utmost price of their damnation,
Not to disturb our useful congregation.
Nor let the learned rabble be forgot,
Those pious hands that crown our hopeful plot.
NTo barter treason with such rogues as w
But subtiler Oliver did not disdain).
His mightier politics with ours to join
His mightier politics with ours to join.
I for all uses in a state was able,
Could mutiny, could fight, hold forth, and cobble.
Your lazy statesman may sometimes direct,
But your small busy knaves the treason act.

So much is undertaken in this prologue that the satire somehow becomes ineffective through its sheer abundance. It is clear, however, that the chief attacks are on the political activities of the Puritans and their reputed use of bribery and corruption to attain their goals.

The play itself is adapted from John Tatham's The Rump (1660). This play satirized the zeal of the Puritan politicians and the struggle for leadership in the Rump Parliament.[51] Other plays which treat the Puritan politicians with considerable scorn and make then extremely despicable characters are the anonymous Life and Death of Mrs. Rump (1660); Francis Kirkman's Presbyterian Lash (1661); the anonymous Hewson Reduced (1661); Robert Howard's The Committee (1662); John Wilson's The Cheats (1663); John Lacy's Old Troop (1665); John Wilson's The Projectors (1665); the anonymous Mr. Turbulent (1682); John Crowne's City Politiques (1683); and the anonymous Puritanical Justice (1697).[52]

But The Roundheads may be taken as the perfect example of all these; for this play details the

---

[51] See Montague Summers, ed., The Works of Aphra Behn (London, 1915), I, 334.

[52] The great outburst of hatred against the Puritans is evidenced in the volume of plays immediately following the Restoration.

struggle in the Rump Parliament, a struggle which is taking place chiefly between Lord Lambert, General of the Army, and Lord Fleetwood. Other Puritan characters and their identifications are: Lord Wariston, Chairman of the Committee of Public Safety; Hewson, Desbro, Dickingfield, Corbet, Lord Whitlock, Commanders and Committeemen; Ananias Goggle, Lay Elder of St. Clement's Parish; Corporal Right, "an Oliverian Commander, but honest, and a Cavalier in his heart."

Loveless, a Royalist, is in love with Lady Lambert; Freeman, his friend, is in love with Lady Desbro. The two of them are talking about the wives of the Puritan officials:

> Loveless--'Tis a Scandal to one of us to converse with 'em; they are all sanctify'd Jilts; and there can neither be Credit nor Pleasure in keeping 'em company; and 'twere enough to get the Scandal of an Adherer to their devilish Politicks, to be seen with 'em.[53]

The attack is on both Puritan hypocrisy and the success of the Puritans in political affairs. But Freeman presses the point:

> Freeman---What, their Wives?
> Loveless--Yes, their Wives. What seest thou in 'em but Hypocrisy? Make love to 'em, they answer in Scripture.
> Freeman---Ay, and lie with you in Scripture too. Of all Whores, give me your zealous Whore;

53I, i--p. 348.

> I never heard a Woman talk much of Heaven,
> but she was much for the Creature too.
> What do'st think I had thee to the Meeting for?[54]

Two common anti-Puritan attacks are expressed here: the love of the Puritans for sensual pleasures while keeping their religion as a mask for these desires and the zeal of the Puritans in all their affairs. Later Loveless condemns the Puritans even more openly for their political pretensions:

> To hear a Rascal hold forth for Bodkins and Thimbles, Contribution, my beloved! to carry on the good Cause, that is, Roguery, Rebellion, and Treason, profaning the sacred Majesty of Heaven, and our glorious Sovereign.[55]

Lambert and Fleetwood both aspire to be king. Accordingly, their opinions of the Puritan means of attaining real political power are significant because of the insight they give into Royalist feeling. Whitlock really speaks for Lambert in the following exchange:

> Lambert---I hate the Memory of that Tyrant Oliver.
> Whitlock--So do I, now he's dead, and serves my Ends no more. I lov'd the Father of the great Heroick whilst he had Power to do me good: he failing, Reason directed me to the Party then prevailing, the Fag-end of the Parliament: 'tis true, I took the Oath of Allegiance, as Oliver, your Lordship, Tony, and the rest did, without which we could not have sat in that Parliament; but that Oath

---

[54] I, i--p. 348.

[55] Ibid.

was not for our Advantage, and so better broke than kept.

Lambert completely agrees with him and Whitlock continues:

> Let Honesty and Religion preach against it. But how cou'd I have serv'd the Commons by deserting the King? how have I show'd my self loyal to your Interest, by fooling Fleetwood, in the deserting of Dick;[56] by dissolving the honest Parliament, and bringing in the odious Rump? how cou'd I have flatter'd Ireton, by telling him Providence brought things about, when 'twas mere Knavery all; and that the Hand of the Lord was in't, when I knew the Devil was in't? or indeed, how cou'd I now advise you to be King, if I had started at Oaths, or preferr'd Honesty or Divinity before Interest and the Good Old Cause.
>
> Lambert---Nay, 'tis most certain, he that will live in this World, must be endu'd with the three rare Qualities of Dissimulation, Equivocation, and mental Reservation.
>
> Whitlock--In which Excellency, Heav'n be prais'd, we out-do the Jesuits.[57]

Puritan honesty and industriousness are thus not given any credit for the Puritans' political success; instead, bribery, corruption, and hypocrisy are the means of obtaining power and the Puritans adhere to none of their fine principles in practice.

The Puritan stress on plainness, simplicity, and economy in living, as a matter of fact, is always pictured as hypocritical just as it was in Jacobean and Caroline

---

[56] He refers to Richard Cromwell.

[57] I, ii--p. 354.

drama. In this play Gilliflower, Loveless, and Lady Lambert express much of the criticism of Puritan plainness and preciseness. Gilliflower says, for example:

> Truly, Madam, there's a great Difference in the Men; yet Heaven at first did its part, but the Devil has since so over-done his, that what with the Vizor of Sanctity, which is the gadly Sneer, the drawing of the Face to a prodigious length, the formal Language, with a certain Twang through the Nose, and the pious Gogle, they are fitter to scare Children than beget love in Ladies.[58]

This is probably the most direct attack on Puritan language, gravity, and bearing in all seventeenth century anti-Puritan satire. It is continued with an attack on the Puritan love of plainness in clothing:

> Oh! 'Tis an Abomination to look like a Gentleman; long Hair is wicked and cavalierish, a Periwig is flat Popery, the Disguise of the Whore of Babylon; handsom Clothes, or lac'd Linen, the very Tempter himself, that debauches all their Wives and Daughters; therefore the diminutive Band, with the Hair of the Reformation Cut, beneath which a pair of large sanctify'd Souses appear, to declare to the World they had hitherto escap'd the Pillory, tho deserv'd it as well as Pryn.[59]

This play actually contains the character of Lady Cromwell; she condemns Lambert's and Fleetwood's actions in their attempts to wrest the power from her son Richard. But the sharpest satire is directed against Ananias

---

[58] II, i--p. 363.

[59] Ibid.

Goggle, the lay elder, in his conversation with Lady Desbro:

> Ananias----Ah, the Children of the Elect have no Business but the great Work of Reformation: Yea verily, I say, all other Business is profane, and diabolical, and devilish; Yea, I say, these Dressings, Curls, and Shining Habiliments--which take so up your time, your precious time; I say, they are an Abomination, yea, an Abomination in the sight of the Righteous, and serve but as an Ignis fatuus, to lead vain Man astray--I say again--
> L. Desbro--Is this your Business, Sir, to rail against our Clothes, as if you intended to preach me into my Primitive Nakedness again?
> Ananias----Ah, the naked Truth is best; but, Madam, I have a little work of Grace to communicate unto you, please you to send your Page away--
> L. Desbro--Withdraw--sure I can make my Party good with one wicked Elder:--Now, Sir, your Bus'ness.--Be brief.
> Ananias----As brief as you please--but--who in the sight of so much Beau--ty--can think of any Bus'ness but the Bus'ness--Ah! hide those tempting Breasts,--Alack, how smooth and warm they are-- [Feeling 'em, and sneering.][60]

Both the insincerity of the Puritans in their agitation against extravagance and vain display are here shown, but the most despicable part of Goggle's character is his brutish immorality. Lady Desbro challenges him about his indecent behavior, and he pleads:

> Ah, Madam! Do not ruin my Reputation; there are Ladies of high Degree in the Commonwealth, to whom we find our selves most comforting; why might you not be one?--for, alas, we are accounted as

---

[60] III, ii--pp. 384-85.

able Men in Ladies Chambers, as in our Pulpits: we serve both Functions--61

But, even though the attack on immorality is so strong and biting, the real importance of the satire in the play arises from its political character. Thus, Lady Desbro's epilogue clearly summarizes the principal Restoration objections to the Puritans:

The vizar's off, and now I dare appear
High for the royal cause in cavalier;
Tho once as true a Whig as most of you,
Could cant, and lie, preach, and dissemble too:
So far you drew me in, but faith I'll be
Revenged on you for thus debauching me:
Some of your pious cheats I'll open lay,
That lead your ignoramus flock astray:
For since I cannot fight, I will not fail
To exercise my talent, that's to rail.
Ye race of hypocrites, whose cloak of zeal
Covers the knave that cants for commonweal,
All laws, the church and state to ruin brings,
And impudently sets a rule on kings;
Ruin, destroy, all's good that you decree
By your infallible presbytery,...

Like those of Lady Desbro's just quoted, the attacks on Puritan zeal, hypocrisy, enthusiasm, and preciseness in Jacobean, Caroline, and Restoration drama were prompted by a hatred of the sincere Puritan opposition to needless extravagance and vanity in English life. Dramatists, like their friends in the court and among the nobility, realized the sincerity of the Puritan movement and the real dangers it posed

61III, ii--pp. 384-85.

on that account. Consequently, in their satire against the reformers the playwrights sought to laugh the Puritan charges away. All that they actually succeeded in doing was to prove the strength of Puritan feeling in English life: the best evidence of the importance of the Puritans in the seventeenth century is obviously their use as targets for satirical attack. Removing the Puritan caricatures from the plays in which they appear would be to remove, in many cases, some of the most interesting parts of these plays. The emphasis of the playwrights on contemporary ideas and events, on the growing "puritanism" of the middle classes, and on the political successes of the Puritan party throughout the century is the soundest guide to the real impact of the Puritan movement on English religious, commercial, political, and social life.

Appendix

Other Plays Containing Anti-Puritan Satire

The following plays, listed chronologically, provide further evidence of the amount and virulence of anti-Puritan satire in seventeenth-century drama.

Chapman, George. Monsieur D'Olive. 1604.

In this play the weaver is given Puritan physical characteristics. (II, i.)

Marston, John. The Malcontent. 1604.

Marston practically equates whores with female Puritans. (V, iv.)

Tourneur, Cyril. The Revenger's Tragedy. 1606.

Emphasized is the ease with which a Puritan's wife could be obtained for immoral purposes. (II, ii.)

Day, John. Law Tricks. 1607.

Act II contains a direct satirical thrust at the Anabaptists.

Armin, Robert. The Two Maids of More-clacke. 1608.

The dramatist identifies a traveling spice merchant as a Puritan.

Day, John. Humour Out of Breath. 1608.

One of the "humours" of the Puritans is the belief that the Cross is a Catholic idol. (IV, i.)

Chapman, George. The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois. 1610.

Clearly expressed is the idea that a Puritan religious innovator is thoroughly contemptible. (I, i.)

Dekker, Thomas. *If It Be Not Good, the Devil Is in It.* 1610.

A Puritan ghost is accused of having a small soul. In explanation, he states that he had practiced too much enthusiasm in his religion and thus used up his soul. (V.)

Marston, John. *The Insatiate Countess.* 1610.

Marston caricatures Isabella for her piety and hypocrisy by having her repent her sins like a Puritan. (III, iv.)

Fletcher, John. *The Woman's Prize.* 1611.

The Puritan emphasis on blessings at meal-times is ridiculed. (III, ii.)

Middleton, Thomas. *The Mayor of Quinborough.* 1618.

Middleton exposes Puritan intolerance and hypocrisy in the character of Oliver.

Middleton, Thomas. *Anything for a Quiet Life.* 1621.

Middleton attacks the Familists, particularly for their lewdness. This is done through emphasizing the ease with which a female Puritan could be enticed to sin. He also shows Puritans unable to endure the organ in the royal chapel. (V, i.)

Davenport, Robert. *New Trick to Catch the Devil.* 1625.

The dramatist treats the Puritan and the Jew as almost identical. (IV, i.)

Sampson, William. The Vow Breaker. 1625.

The Puritans are referred to as drunkards. (I, i.)

Shirley, James. The Bird in a Cage. 1633.

The very name "pope" was anathema to the Puritans. (IV, i.)

Dekker, Thomas. Northward Hoe. 1635.

Puritan mercantile honesty is pictured as only an external matter. (I, i.)

Glapthorne, Henry. The Hollander. 1636.

Through the conversation between Sconce and Urinal, the Puritans are attacked for their attitude toward clerical vestments. (II, i.)

Brome, Richard. The Antipodes. 1638.

Only in a world completely different from the present one would a Puritan like poetry. (I, vi.)

Brome, Richard. The Damoiselle. 1638.

Brome refers to the reformers as "giddy-brained Puritans." (II, i.)

Glapthorne, Henry. Wit in a Constable. 1639.

The Puritan hatred for Catholicism is clearly expressed. (V, i.)

Bibliography

I. Collected and Edited Works

Behn, Aphra. The Works, ed. Montague Summers. 5 vols. London: The Fortune Press, 1927.

The Roundheads--Vol. I

Brome, Richard. Dramatic Works. 3 vols. London: John Pearson, 1873.

Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. 3 vols. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1904.

Carlell, Lodowick. The Fool Would Be a Favourit. London: Golden Cockerel Press, 1926.

Congreve, William. The Works, ed. Montague Summers. 4 vols. Westminster: Nonesuch Press, 1923.

The Old Bachelor--Vol. I
Love for Love--Vol. II

Cowley, Abraham. Essays, Plays, and Sundry Verses, ed. A. R. Waller. Cambridge: University Press, 1906.

Crowne, John. The Dramatic Works, ed. W. H. Logan and J. Maidment. 4 vols. Edinburgh: W. Paterson, 1874.

Sir Courtly Nice--Vol. III

Dekker, Thomas. The Dramatic Works. 4 vols. London: John Pearson, 1873.

Westward Hoe--Vol. II

Durfey, Thomas. A Fool's Preferment, ed. R. S. Forsythe. Western Reserve University Bulletin, Vol. XX, No. 5 (May, 1917).

Etherege, Sir George. The Dramatic Works, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith. 2 vols. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1927.

The Love in a Tub--Vol. I
Man of Mode--Vol. II
She Would if She Could--Vol. II

Ford, John. The Dramatic Works, ed. H. Weber. 2 vols. Edinburgh: George Ramsay and Co., 1811.

The Broken Heart--Vol. I
The Lover's Melancholy--Vol. I

James I, King. Daemonologie. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1924.

Jonson, Ben. Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson. 10 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-47.

Eastward Hoe--Vol. IV
The Alchemist--Vol. V
Volpone--Vol. V
Bartholomew Fair--Vol. VI

Marston, John. The Works, ed. A. H. Bullen. 3 vols. London: J. C. Nimmo, 1887.

The Dutch Courtesan--Vol. II

Massinger, Philip, and Ford, John. The Dramatic Works, ed. Hartley Coleridge. London: Edward Moxon, 1851.

Middleton, Thomas. The Works, ed. A. H. Bullen. 8 vols. London: J. C. Nimmo, 1883-86.

The Family of Love--Vol. III
A Mad World, My Masters--Vol. III
A Chaste Maid in Cheapside--Vol. V

Overbury, Sir Thomas. Miscellaneous Works. London: John Russell Smith, 1856.

Randolph, Thomas. Poetical and Dramatic Works, ed. W.C. Hazlitt. 2 vols. London: privately printed, 1875.

The Conceited Peddler--Vol. I
The Muses' Looking Glass--Vol. I
Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery--Vol. II

_____. Representative English Comedies, ed. C. M. Gayley. 3 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1913.

Sedley, Sir Charles. The Poetical and Dramatic Works, ed. V. de Sola Pinto. London: Constable and Co., 1928.

Shadwell, Thomas. The Complete Works, ed. Montague Summers. 5 vols. London: The Fortune Press, 1927.

The Sullen Lovers--Vol. I
A True Widow--Vol. III

_____. The Doubtful Plays of William Shakespeare, ed. W. C. Hazlitt. London: G. Routledge and Sons, n.d.

Shirley, James. The Dramatic Works and Poems, ed. W. Gifford and A. Dyce. 6 vols. London: John Murray, 1833.

The Witty Fair One--Vol. I
The Traitor--Vol. II
The Lady of Pleasure--Vol. IV
The Cardinal--Vol. V
The Politician--Vol. V

Tourneur, Cyril. The Works, ed. Allardyce Nicoll. London: Fanfrolico Press, 1929.

Vanbrugh, Sir John. The Complete Works, ed. Bonamy Dobree and Geoffrey Webb. 4 vols. London: The Nonesuch Press, 1927-28.

The Relapse--Vol. I

Wycherley, William. The Complete Works, ed. Montague Summers. 4 vols. Westminster: The Nonesuch Press, 1924.

Love in a Wood--Vol. I
The Plain Dealer--Vol. II

II. Biography, Criticism, History

Adams, Henry Hitch. English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Adkins, Mary G. M. Puritanism in the Plays and Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1940.

Allen, Herbert F. A Study of the Comedies of Richard Brome. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1912.

Ball, Robert Hamilton. The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach. Oxford: University Press, 1939.

Baum, Helena W. The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedies. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

Beer, M. Early British Economics. Woking, England: Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1938.

Belloc, Hilaire. Charles, the First, King of England. Philadelphia: J. P. Lipincott and Co., 1933.

Bentley, Gerald Eades. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.

Connely, Willard. Brawny Wycherley. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1930.

Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

Dobree, Bonamy. Restoration Comedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Evans, Herbert Arthur. English Masques. London: Blackie and Son, Ltd., 1897.

Faust, Edward K. R. Richard Brome. Halle, Germany: privately printed, 1887.

Firth, Charles Harding. Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Flynn, John S. The Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1920.

Gray, Alexander. The Development of Economic Doctrine. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1931.

Gretton, R. H. The English Middle Class. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1937.

Halevy, Elie. England in 1815. New York: Peter Smith, 1949.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Harbage, Alfred. Annals of English Drama, 975-1700. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940.

Henson, Herbert Hensley. Puritanism in England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.

Hotson, John Leslie. The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Kerr, Mina. Influence of Ben Jonson on English Comedy, 1598-1642. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1912.

Knappen, Marshall Mason. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Knights, L. C. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937.

Lecky, William E. H. A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 8 vols. New York: D. Appleton Co., 1888-90.

Lindabury, Richard Vliet. A Study of Patriotism in the Elizabethan Drama. Oxford: University Press, 1931.

Lindsay, Thomas Martin. A History of the Reformation. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907-08.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1939.

Miller, Perry. Orthodoxy in Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Puritan Pronaos. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Nason, Arthur Huntington. James Shirley, Dramatist. New York: Arthur H. Nason, 1915.

Neal, D. The History of the Puritans. 5 vols. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: C. Ewer, 1816-17.

Ogg, David. England in the Reign of Charles II. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.

Osgood, Charles Grosvenor. The Voice of England. New York: Harper Brothers, 1935.

Pearson, A. F. S. Church and State. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.

Pearson, A. F. S. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

Perry, Henry T. E. The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.

Pickel, Margaret Barnard. Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama. London: Frederick Muller, Ltd., 1936.

Plum, Harry Grant. Restoration Puritanism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943.

Tawney, Richard Henry. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1926.

Thompson, Elbert Nevius S. The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1903.

Wakeman, Henry Offley. The Church and the Puritans. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1897.

Ward, A. W., et al. The Cambridge Modern History. 13 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1934.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1930.

Whitelock, Sir Bulstrode. Memorials of English Affairs. 4 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1853.

Wright, Louis B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

III. Articles in Periodicals

Adkins, Mary G. M. "The Genesis of Dramatic Satire against the Puritans, as Illustrated in 'A Knack to Know a Knave.'" Review of English Studies, XXII (April, 1946), 81-95.

Davis, Joe Lee. "The Case for Comedy in Caroline Theatrical Apologetics," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LVIII (June, 1943), 353-71.

Dunkel, Wilbur D. "The Authorship of 'The Puritan,'" Publications of the Modern Language Association, XLV (September, 1930), 804-08.

Forsythe, Robert Stanley. "A Study of the Plays of Thomas Durfey," Western Reserve University Bulletin, Vol. XIX, No. 5 (May, 1916).

Holaday, Allan. "Thomas Heywood and the Puritans," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XLIX (July, 1950), 192-203.

Levin, Harry. "Jonson's Metempsychosis," Philological Quarterly, XXII (January, 1943), 231-39.

Lounsbury, Thomas R. "A Puritan Censor of the Stage," Yale Review, n.s. XII (July, 1923), 790-810.

Whiting, George R. "Political Satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83," Modern Philology, XXVIII (August, 1930), 29-43.

Wright, Louis B. "The Reading of Plays During the Puritan Revolution," Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 6 (November, 1934), 73-108.